

Some Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont

By Peter Allix

1690, 1821

Oxford: At the Clarendon Press

[Note from the publisher. This valuable out-of-print book was carefully formatted for electronic publication by Way of Life Literature. For a catalog of other books, both current and old, in print and electronic format, contact us at fbns@wayoflife.org, or on the web at www.wayoflife.org.



Catholic mobs brutally persecuting Bible-believing Christians in the 14th century

THE LIFE OF PETER ALLIX (1641-1717)

The following is from the Introduction to the Church History Research & Archives (1989) edition of Allix's *Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont* --

Peter Allix was born in France in 1641 and died in London in 1717. Though he was not a Baptist, he was a learned scholar and historian of the Church of England. He penned over twenty-five published works from 1672 to 1711, including the two histories on the Churches of Piedmont and of the Albigenses. These two works are widely accepted and treasured by Baptists. Many later historians who reference Peter Allix's writings include David Benedict, Adam Blair, Joseph Bingham, William Jarrell, William Jones, John Lawrence, Mosheim, G.H. Orchard, and Robert Robinson.

THE PREFACE

The Bishop of Meaux has lately published a treatise, entitled, *The History of the Variations of Protestants*. He had formed the draft of it some years ago, to engage the French court to recall the Edict of Nantes, without any scruple or hesitation. The pretense seemed very plausible: the Clergy, who were both party and judge against the Protestants, were to declare, that forasmuch as the French Protestants had changed their belief, the court was no longer obliged to the observation of an edict which Henry IV. had granted to their ancestors, who were of other principles. But this edict being recalled before the Bishop's work was finished, and the French court, which is not guilty of being over scrupulous, not thinking itself to stand in need of so vain a pretense, the Bishop was fain to employ his work to another use. His design therefore in the present publishing thereof is to deceive those, who by ways of violence have been made to enter into the bosom of the Romish Church, and whom the same violence keeps there, against the sense of their conscience.

This Prelate had before endeavored, in his *Exposition of the Roman Faith*, where he employs his utmost artifice to sweeten, disguise, and dissemble the matters and difficulties in controversy, to abuse the Protestants, in order to make them more easily digest the Roman religion, than they are apt to do when they view it in its natural colors. And now in this his *History of their Variations*, he endeavors to represent to them the belief of the Reformers, and most illustrious Protestant Doctors, in the strangest colors imaginable; that those whom the dragoons have converted to the Roman faith might look upon the force that has been made use of to drive them from so detestable a communion as a saving and charitable violence. It is always the same spirit of falsification and juggling that animates and guides him.

In this his last design, it had been natural for him, had his intention been right, to have endeavored to make out, that the Protestants, or their teachers, were divided in their belief of the articles of the Creed; about the object of prayer, and the necessity thereof; about the necessity of obedience to the commands of God, as well as the extent of that obedience; and about the doctrine and number of the sacraments: for in these points it is that the Protestants make the essence of their religion to consist. Now it is well known, that in all these they do agree: the questions that are ventilated among them being, like those questions that remained among the primitive Christians, upon several points of divinity; and some of them being no other than mere controversies, about which the Protestants have learnt to divide themselves in imitation of the Schools of the Romish Divines. But had the Bishop followed this method, he would have failed of his end; wherefore he thought it sufficient for his purpose slightly to touch the matters in controversy, and to put into good French whatsoever he could rake together from the writings of those of his communion, to expose the first Reformers, and to make the Reformation odious.

It would be an affront put upon the age we live in, to imagine that this thick laying on of paint should be capable to impose upon any that have never so little judgment left. The Bishop may please to flatter himself with the success of his first work, the *Exposition of the Romish Faith*: but I believe him too sincere not to own, that he has made no impression upon the spirit of any Protestants, save such only who were ready to embrace the first pretences that were offered, to rid themselves of a religion that exposed them to so many miseries; or the profession whereof hindered their settlement in the world. Those who have been forced to become Papists against their consciences have found by experience, that it was not sufficient for them to subscribe the *Exposition of the Bishop of Meaux*: No: their persecutors were not at all minded to make them of his religion; but they were fain to swallow whole and entire the Profession of Faith drawn up by Pius IV.

And we may assure the Bishop, that the same will be the lot of this present work, which he has entitled, *The History of the Variations of the Protestants in Matters of Faith*. For let us suppose that this Prelate has very well proved what he pretends to make out, what will follow from hence, but only this; that the Reformers were not infallible; that they did not at first reject all that deserved to be censured as Popery; that some difficulties have been met with in the hypothesis of those who were not happy enough to refine and clear such corrupt matters; in a word, that they did not at first discover all that was to be known and believed as to several points of divinity, and that they were fain to take a great deal of pains in the

discovery of that truth which the Roman Church had taken so much pains to obscure and confound? We will suppose a Protestant casuist at this time to write about matters of conscience, and, for want of examining with sufficient care the decisions of licentious casuists, to follow some of them, being seduced by the false principles of these Roman casuists, which the Bishop of Meaux condemns; will it follow, that an hundred and fifty years after this some other Bishop of Meaux will have right to propose, under the title of Protestant Variations, the mistaken opinion of this casuist, though afterwards his party, perceiving the delusion, have declared against his opinion?

The Bishop is very pleasant in forbidding the Protestants to make use of the way of recrimination against the Church of Rome, in this point of variation, though indeed one only instance of variation in faith, of fifty whereof we can convince them, be a sufficient conviction of a Church which pretends herself to be immovable, because infallible. But being very sensible of the weakness of his cause in this point, he found he should be obliged, either to acknowledge that his Church is a false Church, and much more deserving that censure than the Protestant, as having been subject to a far greater number of variations in her belief; or else that he would be obliged to make use of the same answer we do, in renouncing the infallibility of his Church. But it is no matter of wonder, if by degrees only we come to the perfect knowledge of the truth.

Moreover, is it not a very pleasant method, to reduce the dispute to the examination of some preliminaries, whereas the ground itself has been disputed above these hundred and fifty years.

In a word, whatsoever the Reformers may have been, yet it is but just that the Church of Rome, being accused of heresy, idolatry, and tyranny, should clear herself of these accusations. Whatsoever may have been the carriage of Constantinus Copronymus, how can the manners of that emperor be concerned in the question, Whether the worshipping of images be contrary to the law of God? The reformation of Jehu, king of Israel, did it cease to be a reformation from Ahab's idolatry, though he himself were a wicked person and an hypocrite, and though he did the thing but imperfectly?

In truth, the care the Bishop of Meaux has taken in his Preface and whole book, to represent to us the immutability of his Church, and her constancy in matters of faith and worship, has opened so fair a field to his antagonists, whom he attacks about the history of the Reformation in the several parts of Europe, and particularly in France, that he could not reasonably expect but to be opposed by them on all sides, with all the vigor imaginable. There are still some Lutherans, who have already made it appear, they are not at all afraid of the reproaches of a party, whose head that condemned them, Leo X. was an avowed atheist, and who looked upon the Gospel to be no better than a fable. There are French Protestants left still, whom Providence has delivered from the bloody hands of the Bishops of France, to maintain the interest of the Reformation; neither does England want able divines sufficient to repel all the Bishop of Meaux's slanders. After all, I hope the Bishop will give us leave to examine a little the constancy of his Church, as to her faith and worship. In expectation therefore that the several authors, whom the Bishop of Meaux has been pleased to assault, will give him full satisfaction; which as it is no hard matter for them to do, so I question not but they will do it very suddenly: I thought I might take to task one of his books, viz. the XI. wherein he treats concerning the Albigenses and the Waldenses; and forasmuch as therein he has carried calumny to the highest degree imaginable, I thought it was my duty, in examining this part of his book, to give a scantling of his fair dealing, and the sincerity he employs in delivering the history of those two ancient Churches, to whom the reformed party are so much obliged.

I know well enough that the strength of our defense does not depend on the justifying of those Churches. Let the Albigenses have been Manichees, as the Bishop pretends to prove them; let the Waldenses have been only a company of schismatics, as the Bishop is pleased to call them; the grounds of the Reformation will remain just and firm for all that, if the foundation of our reasons holds good, and if the Church of Rome be guilty of the errors, idolatry, and tyranny, whereof we accuse her. But I conceived,

1. That it was well becoming a Christian to undertake the defense of innocence, oppressed and overborne by the blackest calumnies the Devil could ever invent.
2. That we should be ungrateful towards those whose sufferings for Christ have been so beneficial to his Church, should we not take care to justify their memory, when we see it so maliciously bespattered and torn.

3. That to justify the Waldenses and Albigenses is indeed to defend the Reformation and Reformers, they having so long before us, with an exemplary courage, endeavored to preserve the ancient Christian religion, which the Church of Rome all this while has endeavored to abolish, by substituting a bastard and supposititious Christianity instead thereof.

Whilst the Ministers of the Church of Rome think fit to follow his conduct, who was a liar and murderer from the beginning; innocence ought at least to have leave to defend herself against their calumnies, whilst she willingly resigns to God the vengeance of the injustice and violence of those who have oppressed her.

It is not my design here to write the whole history of the Waldenses and Albigenses; that has been done already in several parts, by four or five famous authors, whose books are in all hands; I mean Chassagnon, Perrin, the most learned Archbishop of Armagh, Giles Leger, and Morland. If any thing may be added to their writings, it is concerning the original of those Churches, their condition before the twelfth century, and their total ruin about two or three years ago.

It is for those that live in the neighborhood of Piedmont, and who have received into their bosom the miserable remains of those so pure and so ancient Churches, to preserve the memory of so dreadful a desolation. I hope also that their piety and zeal will prompt them to search with all the exactness possible, for what may serve to continue the sequel of the history of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, since the time where Morland and Leger end their works. I am persuaded also, that those who have undertaken to write an account of the ruin of the Churches of France, will not forget to set down the particulars of that persecution, which has destroyed the flourishing flocks of the province of Languedoc, a country where the Reformation met with so easy a reception at first, because of the remainders of the doctrine of the Albigenses, who had dwelt there for so long a time.

What I undertake in these my reflections is only this; to set down the true antiquity of both these Churches, who were so famous in the thirteenth century, because of the opposition they made against the corruptions which the Romish Church had introduced in matters of faith, worship, and the government of the Church. And as they then maintained, that they derived their original from the Apostles, so I hope to make out, that in so doing they advanced nothing which is not exactly conformable to the history of the ages past, from the time of the Apostles to the thirteenth century. This is that I shall endeavor, by making out the succession of these Churches, as well with respect to their doctrine and worship, as with respect to their ministry.

As this design will engage me in the discussion of a great number of authors, who have lived from the time of the Apostles to the said thirteenth century, so it will be difficult to give so smooth a form to these observations, as might be expected in a continued history. In this case it is unavoidable, but the discourse will prove here and there dry and rugged, what pains soever may be taken to the contrary. But to make amends for this, we may promise, that the judicious reader, who is only in quest of truth, will find abundantly wherewith to satisfy himself, by examining the matters of fact set down in these observations.

I shall treat of the history of each of these Churches in particular, and observe much the same method in the one as the other; and am not without hope, that the remarks I shall make will serve to confound the injustice of those, who, though they know that what the Protestants believe and practice is truly apostolical, cease not to wrangle and prevaricate, upon pretense that we cannot show them any Church before the Reformation, or at least before the twelfth century, which has absolutely defended the same opinions as we do. This also will be of use to strengthen the faith of Protestants, who will perceive from thence, that God, according to his promise, hath never left himself without witness, as having preserved in the bosom of these two Churches most illustrious professors of the Christian religion, which they held in the same purity with which their predecessors had received this precious pledge from the hand of those apostolical men, who at first planted these Churches among the Alps and Pyrenaean mountains, that they might be exposed to the view of four or five kingdoms all at once. I begin with the Churches of Italy.

CHAPTER 1

Concerning the first rise and original of the Churches of Italy

By Italy, I do not understand here the several countries which, at this day, bear that name, but only the seven provinces to which that name was given, by way of distinction, and which constituted a particular government, being particularly under the care of the lieutenant of the western Praetorian Prefect. These provinces were Liguria, Aemilia, Flaminia, Venetia, the Alps, both Cottian and Greek, and Rhaetia, or the country of the Grisons. There were three legions amongst the troops of the empire, which peculiarly had the name of Italic, because probably at first they had been raised in that diocese; whereof Milan was the capital city, and the place of residence of the lieutenant we have just now mentioned.

Baronius takes it for an undoubted truth, that St. Barnabas, the famous companion of St. Paul in the work of the ministry, was the first founder of the Church of Milan, and of the Churches of Liguria, which he refers to the year 51 of our Savior Jesus Christ; that is, to the forty-ninth year, if we rectify his chronology. In defending this his opinion, he grounds himself on very sure traditions, as he reckons upon the records of the Church of Milan, and upon the testimonies of many authors. Ughel-lus is of the same mind, and Ripamontius, who hath written the history of that Church, from the beginning thereof, and sets down all he could get together for support of this opinion. But to speak my sense plainly concerning this opinion of Baronius, and those that follow him therein; I believe they have abused themselves by following late authorities, and such as cannot make out so ancient a matter. All this so sure tradition, and these monuments of the Church of Milan, owe their rise to the foolish vanity, which the emulation of the western Prelates, for precedency and jurisdiction, has given birth to, since the eighth century- indeed, since that time, there is scarcely a considerable church in Italy, France, Spain, or England, that did not challenge some Apostle, or disciple of the Apostles, for their founder.

I acknowledge that the Liturgy, which bears the name of St. Ambrose, supposes St. Barnabas to have been the first Bishop of Milan; but that alone is sufficient to make it appear, that that Liturgy, as well as others of the same nature, hath suffered great alterations since its first reception in that diocese. The later ages have made a great part of their piety to consist in inventing these fables, and the ignorance and blind zeal of people hath prompted them to entertain impertinent legends as articles of faith, whereof the least footstep is not to be found in the first monuments of antiquity. The leamest men of the Church of Rome have, in a manner, wholly banished these apostolical originals into the land of fables, from whence they all proceeded at first; though some sooner, others later, yet all of them since the eighth century, as we have hinted. Baronius therefore ought to have called to mind here that judicious maxim, with reference to history, which he himself allegeth elsewhere, *Quod sine antiquo autore dicitur, contemnitur*; "Whatsoever is asserted without the testimony of some ancient author ought to be despised."

Though it is plain, I might draw some advantage in the sequel of my discourse, from the confession of Baronius and other authors that have written the originals of the Churches of Liguria; yet I shall take heed of making use of it, my aim being not to gain any tiling by the ignorance or fabulousness of our adversary, but exactly to search out truth. Accordingly I find,

1. That the ancient ecclesiastical history doth not give us the least, hint, that ever St. Barnabas preached in Italy, properly so called. Several authors, as Origen and St. Chrysostom, give not him the same allotment that the later historians of Milan have done.
2. I find it was a thing wholly unknown in the time of St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, as also to Pope Innocent the First, in the beginning of the fifth century.
- 3, I do not find that any of the authors who lived in that diocese, as St. Ambrose, St. Maximus, and others, have ever set forth the glory of this apostolical foundation of the Church of Milan by St. Barnabas.
- 4, Petrus Damianus might alone have served to correct this erroneous opinion of Baronius: for being sent to

persuade the Church of Milan to submit to that of Rome, he doth not at all take notice of the Clergy of Milan, pretending to descend from St. Barnabas; but maintains to their face, that they had received the Gospel from the Bishops of the Church of Rome. There is no man of any judgment, who is never so little versed in the history of the Church, on whom these remarks will not make a greater impression, than all those fables on which Baronius, and others like him, have built, in order to establish their pretended tradition.

I am not ignorant, that since the thirteenth century, Raynerius reports, that the Churches of the Waldenses maintained, that they were apostolical Churches: but the word apostolical must then be taken in the sense Tertullian gives it in his book of *Prescriptions*, which I have just now alleged, *Nascentes ex matricibus apostolicis deputantur ut soboles apostolicarum Ecclesiarum*. Indeed, they are never the less apostolical, because they did not receive the doctrine of the Gospel immediately from the Apostles themselves. It is sufficient to make them deserve the name of apostolical, that they received the doctrine of the Apostles, as a pledge from the hand of their first disciples, which they preserved so very tenderly throughout the following ages.

It is hard to determine whether it was in the first century that these apostolical men planted the Christian religion at Milan, and the diocese thereunto belonging; or whether it were done in the second century; forasmuch as Milan was a considerable city in those primitive times, and we find that the Churches of Lyons and Vienna were already famous in the second age, by reason of their martyrs, apostolic men having first of all preached in the capital cities, that the Gospel from thence, as the head spring, might diffuse itself throughout the whole diocese, and so facilitate the propagation thereof. I am very much inclined to believe, either that the same preachers who came from Greece, out of the bosom of the apostolic Church, to plant the faith amongst the Gauls, did also cultivate the diocese of Milan, that belonged to Gallia Cisalpina: or, that the disciples of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who for their master Jesus Christ had conquered the cities neighboring to Borne, pursued their victories as far as Milan and its diocese.

I do not think any man can precisely define the time of their preaching, those first disciples having been much more careful to preach the Gospel, than to write the history of it. For, we cannot rely much upon what they tell us concerning the first successors of St. Barnabas at Milan, no more than we can upon that which they assert, that St. Barnabas was the founder of that Church. Lastly, I do not think it necessary to show, (as some reformed Divines do,) that the Bagaudae, of whom mention is made in the time of Dioclesian, were the predecessors of the Waldenses, and that they were both Christians and martyrs. It is true that they build this their opinion upon the martyrdom of St. Maurice, and of the Thebaean legion, which seems to be confirmed by the life of St. Babolenus, published by Chiffetius at the end of Bede. But this foundation is of no strength. The martyrdom of the Thebaean legion is no more than a ridiculous fable, unknown to all the ancient historians of the Church; published by some impostor, under the name of St. Eucherius: and the life of St. Babolenus is a ridiculous legend, being no ways fit to confirm so great an action of that antiquity. We need only read what is set down by those ancient authors, who make mention of these Bagaudae, and it will be found, that we cannot with reason make Christians of them.

But, however it may be, and though we should acknowledge, that the Church of Milan was founded by the care of the successors of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome; yet it is of importance to observe, that this can give no right to the Bishop of Rome over him of Milan, no more than St. Polycarp acquired any right over the several dioceses amongst the Gauls, whose churches were founded by those whom he had sent abroad to preach the Gospel. Pope Innocent the First complains, in his Epistle to Decentius, that the Bishops of his own province did not follow the customs of the Church of Rome. If this happened in his own province, which without doubt had been converted by the endeavors of his predecessors, we may very well judge, that the first preachers of Milan and its diocese had not subjected Milan to the Bishop of Rome. This is acknowledged by Pope Pius the Second, who owns, in his Apology for the Romish Church, written in the year 1457, that before the Council of Nice small regard was had to the Bishop of Rome. It is very necessary that this truth should be solidly proved, which accordingly I design to do in the sequel of this work; and to show the independence of that diocese on the Bishops of Rome: my business at present is to lay down the belief and worship of those Churches which were planted by the disciples of the Apostles, and will be the subject of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2

The state of the Christian religion, in the diocese of Italy, until the end of the fourth century

Forasmuch as we have scarce any author of this diocese, during the three hundred and fifty-first years after the birth of Jesus Christ, whose writings are still in being, it will be impossible for us to give an account of the state of the Christian religion in that diocese, any other way than by considering the state of the neighboring dioceses, and most other Churches during that interval. But with this assistance we may be able to supply the want of those authors, whose memory time hath buried in oblivion, or whose writings have been destroyed by persecutions or by barbarisms.

We cannot doubt but that the principal articles of their faith were contained in the Apostles' Creed, which, though it were not written by the Apostles, yet was received with a general approbation, as appears from what Tertullian and St. Irenaeus tell us. Neither did they, without doubt, own any other tradition, besides that of St. Irenaeus, that nothing ought to be laid down for certain truth, but what Jesus Christ hath taught, or the Apostles written, and left to the apostolical Churches as a sacred depositum.

It is undoubtedly, sure, that this was the instruction which was given to the Catechumeni, who, after private instructions, were earnestly exhorted to read the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, to confirm and advance themselves in the knowledge of the truths of the Christian religion. And it is as sure that the strangers, who came with this profession, were received as brethren, and they looked upon as heretics who advanced any doctrine contrary to the abridgment of the Christian faith.

The Bishops, when they preached, took the holy Scripture for the subject of their sermon; they explained the mysteries thereof. The Priests and Deacons did as much afterwards, by order of the Bishops, in the several places where they were settled; the one as well as the other being called to their offices by the consent of the people, without which their ministry was not acknowledged, or owned.

They admitted the Catechumeni, after an exact instruction, and baptized them on Easter-day and Whit-Sunday, and prepared them for the receiving of that sacrament by long continued fasts, which were prescribed them, and which the Church observed with them, to witness to them the concern they took in their conversion.

The Catechumeni did not assist at the celebration of the Eucharist, but were admitted to it after that they had received Baptism, and before that were to make confession of their sins, in token of their contrition. It was not till some time after the Apostles, yea even till after the second century, that anointings were added to the ceremony of Baptism, as well before as after the receiving of it; which was the charge of the Bishops, who gave the chrism to the new baptized, together with the imposition of hands. The new baptized were clothed in white, eight days after their baptism: before which they gave them salt to taste, and milk and honey to drink. Thus by little and little did they stuff out this holy ceremony, as if it were come too plain and homely out of the hands of our Savior and his Apostles.

They received the Lord's Supper immediately after Baptism, and the people offered bread and wine on the table whereof they communicated. All that were present were obliged to communicate. The Deacons proclaimed the Sursum corda, which was a sufficient hint that they were to seek Christ with their hearts in heaven, and that they looked upon that ceremony as a commemoration. Both men and women received the Sacrament in their hands, without any adoration exhibited to it, and they communicated all under both kinds.

We do not find that they prayed to any, but God through Jesus Christ; they prayed to him for the penitents, for believers, for all the necessities of the Church and the world, for the conversion of the

heathens, Jews, and heretics, for the emperors, and for the government. They blessed God for the triumphant death of the martyrs; and in process of time they prayed for the dead, that God would be pleased to make them partakers of the first resurrection, which was not till after the doctrine of the temporal reign of one thousand years was introduced.

They carried the Eucharist to the sick, and those that were absent, and they called it the viaticum; a name which would better have suited with extreme unction, had that been the last sacrament of the Church. The Bishops were every one of them heads of their Churches, but they acted nothing without the consent of the Clergy of their Church, and the people. The Priests administered the lesser Churches, but so as that their behavior, as well as their ordination, depended on the Bishop and his Clergy, who exercised discipline upon the delinquents. They were the Bishop's council, they preached, they baptized, they celebrated the Eucharist, they governed the parishes, as well those that were in the city, as in the country; they had Deacons, who expounded also the Gospel, who distributed the Eucharist, who carried it to those that were absent, who baptized, and who sometimes, in less considerable places, had the oversight of Churches. They were ordinarily those that visited the sick and prisoners, and that took care of the temporal concerns of the Church.

In process of time the number of Church-officers was multiplied: there were sub-deacons, acolythi, readers, exorcists, choristers, porters, and men that buried the dead: all these were reduced under the title of Church-officers: whereas before, the Bishops and Priests performed the duty of exorcists, which consisted only in praying over the heads of those that were believed to be possessed of the Devil, or which were overtaken with maladies that were looked upon as possessions. The Diaconesses, who were of apostolical institution, and received the imposition of hands, and who, together with the virgins and widows, made, as it were, a part of the Clergy, were employed, to instruct the women in their houses, to visit the prisoners, and to prepare and dispose those of their own sex for the reception of Baptism.

They made a very exact scrutiny into the manners and knowledge of those that were admitted into the number of the Clergy; but it was not required of them in some places to forbear the company of their wives, in order to their admission, until the beginning of the fourth century; neither was it approved of by the Council of Nice in the year 325, which left them at liberty in that respect. In process of time they rarely admitted any to Orders that were married, except they made a vow to abstain from their wives. Pope Siricius was one of the first that endeavored to introduce the usage of ecclesiastical celibacy, and to make it pass into a law for his diocese.

The Church had at the first divided sins into two sorts: there were sins, which whosoever was found guilty of were excommunicated for ever: these were idolatry, murder, and adultery: the others did not exclude the persons guilty for ever from being reconciled to the Church, but only laid a necessity upon them of doing public penance at the church-gate; which at first was done with less severity during the two first centuries, but afterwards was made subject to more strict and severe rules, and continued for some years together, the Church requiring these precautions, the better to be assured of the sincerity of their conversion. The intercession of martyrs and confessors, or the apparent danger of death, wherein the penitents were fallen, obliged the Church to remit somewhat of the severity of these rules, which was called Indulgence.

The respect they had for confessors and for martyrs gave them a great authority, though many times they were only women or laics: oftentimes by their solicitations peace was granted to penitents, especially if they were any way related to them. The memory of their death was celebrated with thanksgivings to God for their triumph; which commemoration was renewed every year. Their bodies were buried very carefully; and the churchyards being often the most secure places for the assemblies of Christians, they celebrated the Eucharist in the same places, and upon their tombs. They boasted of their communion; and, from an heathenish conceit, which crept in during the fourth century, they considered them as present, and joining their prayers with the Church for the salvation of those who resorted to their graves. The veneration they had for their relics was carried so far, after the midst of the fourth century, that in diverse places they lighted lamps and wax candles on their tombs, and brought thither bread and wine, to eat and drink at their graves, and celebrate a kind of feast in honor of them. St. Austin in his Confessions observes, that his mother, willing to observe this African custom at Milan, was reproved therefore by St. Ambrose, as being a heathenish custom, and that she acquiesced in the Bishop's determination.

In the fourth century images began to be introduced into some churches, viz. the pictures of martyrs: but they knew nothing yet of painting the Deity, or of giving the images any religious worship.

They made the sign of the cross on all occasions, as if it had been an abridgment of the profession of Christianity amongst the heathens, or a powerful weapon against the devils.

They did not bury any at first, but in the churchyards; afterwards they began to bury in places adjoining to the church, and at last in the churches themselves. And it was in those church-yards, ever since the third century, that they celebrated the sacrament of the Eucharist, to render thanks to God for the deliverance of those, whose decease had been commendable and praiseworthy.

In the fourth century they consecrated churches but to God alone, and distinguished them from those places where the bodies of martyrs were buried.

They read only in the churches the canonical Scriptures, with the respect due unto the word of God; to which they afterwards joined some hymns composed by some men of great renown, and the sufferings of martyrs, whose examples were of use to confirm the faith of the Church.

The people sang in their assemblies the Psalms of David; and this was the most ordinary exercise of believers, when they met together before day, and at other hours set apart for public acts of piety.

They almost continually concluded the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with feasts of charity, to comfort the poor, and to entertain brotherly unity amongst believers. At the breaking up of these feasts, they gave alms, which were employed for the maintenance of the poor, and the Clergy, who had no other incomes, until that Constantine had embraced the Christian religion.

They celebrated fasts that were very different as to their duration: some ending after three of the clock in the afternoon, some lasting the whole day; but all of them consisted in a total abstinence from meat and drink. Some of these fasts were kept every week, on Wednesday and Friday; the Church of Rome fasted also on Saturday. These days of fasting having not been instituted by the authority of the Apostles, according to the general consent of ancient Christians, and every one using them with great liberty. The body of the Christian Churches continued united together by the bond of one and the same faith, and by the mutual care which every Bishop took to keep up the same zeal for the purity of manners, as for that of faith. If there happened any difference, the Bishops and the Priest of the same province assembled, and determined the matter, without any appeal: and it was not till the midst of the fourth century, when the dioceses were better formed, that the Council of Sardica granted to Pope Julius, Bishop of Rome, the privilege of examining afresh all causes that had been determined in the provincial synods; which however never, took full effect, all the Greeks, and a great part of the Latins having rejected that Canon. The Bishops of Rome endeavored to attribute and preserve to themselves this authority, though they could never bring it about, but by means of the favor of the Emperors Gratian at the end of the fourth age, and of Valentinian the Third in the midst of the fifth age.

This was the general state of the Church, whilst under the heathen persecutions, and after having endured the furies of Arianism, which almost wholly laid her waste, during the fourth century. On which occasion I desire the reader to observe:

First, That the most part of the human constitutions I have mentioned were not observed with that rigour, with which Rome imposeth them at present.

Secondly, That some part of those Church-orders have been changed and abolished in process of time.

Thirdly, That a considerable part of these customs, unknown to Scripture, had their rise from a design the Christians had of accommodating themselves to the notions of the Jews and heathens.

Fourthly, That the opinions amongst the ancient Christians upon many questions of divinity being very different, they made use of great forbearance one with another, as long as they did but agree in matters of faith.

Fifthly, That although they received not men excommunicated for scandalous manners in another diocese; notwithstanding the excommunications of one diocese did not hinder, but that those who could prove the injustice thereof might communicate with those whom the Bishops of another diocese had excommunicated.

Sixthly, That every diocese was looked upon as being independent of all other authority: so that what respect soever they might have for the apostolical Churches, yet did not they think themselves obliged to follow them, in case they were persuaded that they had violated the purity of the faith.

And now having made these general observations, which are to be applied to. the state of the diocese of Italy in particular, we shall proceed to what farther information we can get from those authors who have wrote and lived in this diocese.

CHAPTER 3

Opinions of authors of the diocese of Italy, in the fourth century, concerning, matters of faith and worship

Forasmuch as the Doctors of the Roman Church generally acknowledge, that the Church of this diocese continued pure until the fourth century, and that it enjoyed the communion of the Pope of Rome; it will not be needful particularly to examine, what was the faith of that diocese about the articles which the Church of Rome rejects or receives in common with Protestants: our business, to speak properly, being only to inquire concerning those articles and ways of worship, which the Church of Rome considers as making a part of their religion, and which the Protestants reject, as being more proper to corrupt, than perfect it. If it be then certain and evident, that the believers of that diocese were either altogether ignorant of, or formally rejected those articles of faith, and that worship, which the Church of Rome prescribes to its people, and which she imposeth on the rest of the world under pain of damnation; it will most evidently appear by this, that these believers were not of the Romish religion, but that, in respect of their faith and worship, they were true Protestants.

And of this it is easy to convince an unprejudiced reader, by examining, century after century, the writings of the ecclesiastical authors of that diocese. I begin with St. Ambrose, who died anno 397, after having possessed the see of Milan twenty-three years. This great man (whose eulogy is set down by Cassiodore in three words, when he calls him *virtutum Episcopum, arcera fidei, oratorera catholicum*; "the Bishop of virtues, the castle of faith, the catholic orator") can inform us, whether or no his diocese embraced those maxims which the Protestants, in conformity with the Waldenses, do condemn in the Church of Rome.

If we desire to know what he believed concerning the fullness and sufficiency of the Scripture, he maintains, that there we are to learn that which makes the object of our faith; because therein the Father, the Son, the Prophets, and the Apostles, satisfy and answer the questions of believers. Lib. 1. de Fide, ad Gratian. e. 4.

Would you know, according to what standard he believed the versions of the Scripture ought to be examined? He will answer you, that it must be by the original. Lib. 2. de Spir. S. cap. 6. et de Incarnat. cap. 8.

If the Scripture seems any where obscure, what is to be done in this case, according to his judgment? We are to compare the several passages, et aperietur, saith he, non ab alio, sed a Dei verbo; "and it shall be opened to thee, not from another, but from the word of God," in Psalm 118. Sermon. 8.

See here one of his maxims concerning what is maintained at this day about the succession of the Bishop of Rome to the rights of St. Peter: "Those who have not the faith of Peter, neither can they pretend to the inheritance of Peter" lib 1. de Poe-nit. c. 6. And indeed how could he have spoke otherwise, after the apostasy of Liberius to the heresy of the Arians? Neither do we find him acknowledging any other rock of the Church besides Jesus Christ, or other foundation of the Church but the true faith; for so he expresseth himself in Luc. 1. c. 9. & lib. 5. Epist. 32.

He considers the justification of a sinner as consisting in the remission of sins. De dacob, et Vita beata, lib. 1. c. 6. and in other places. He leaves no room for the merit of works, and maintains, that all our glory consists in the remission of our offenses. De Bono Mortis, c. 2.

He maintains, that the alone sufferings of Jesus Christ are the means of our justification, without any concurrence of our own good works: Ecce Agnus Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi, et ideo, emo gloriatur in operibus, quia nemo factis suis justificabitur. "Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the

world, and therefore let no man glory in his works, because no man shall be justified by his own doings." Epist. 71. lib. 9

Would you know, whether St. Ambrose did believe the seven sacraments, as does the Church of Rome? You need only call to mind, that St. Au-gustin, who had been his disciple, owned only two, viz. Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

He took care to distinguish that which is visibly done, from that which is invisibly celebrated: so far was he from tying grace to the sacraments themselves, as the Church of Rome does. Epist. 84. et de Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3, cap. 11.

Let any one judge, whether he did believe the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, when he wrote these words, in Luc. lib. 10. c. 24. Seek those things which are on high, where Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of God? And lest we should believe, that it is rather the duty of the eyes, than of the soul, he here speaks of, he adds, "Savor the things that are on high, and not those that are on the earth." So then, it is not on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, that we must seek him, if we would find him. Lastly, Stephen did not look for Christ upon earth; Stephen touched him, because he sought him in heaven. Jesus Christ is present, according to the manner of our seeking him.

It is well known, that in his time the Church communicated under two kinds: besides, he overthrows the possibility of a body existing in more places at once: he maintains, that the Gospel has only the image, and not the truth; and in several places he explodes the carnal manducation, which the Church of Rome admits of.

This makes it very evident, that he knew nothing of the sacrifice of the Mass: indeed, he formally opposes the same, and maintains, lib. 1. de Offic. c. 41. that since his passion, he offers up himself only by way of representation, as being really and in truth in heaven, where, as our advocate, he intercedes for us.

If we read the death of St. Ambrose, related by Paulinus in his Life, we shall find nothing there, either of confession, or of adoration of the Eucharist, when he received it, or of extreme unction practiced there, no more than at the death of a true Protestant.

Would we know his thoughts concerning the religious worship of creatures? He is the author of this maxim, That we may not serve any creature; a foundation to prove that Jesus Christ is God, because the Scripture teaches us, that we ought to worship him. De Fide, ad Gratian. lib. 1. c. 7. And it is with respect to the same that he proves, that the Holy Ghost is God, because he has temples. De Spit. Sancto, lib. ,3. c. 13. As to the use of images in religious worship, see how eloquently he expresses himself, De Fuga Seculi, c. 5.

"Holy Rachel hid the images, that is to say, the Church or wisdom because the Church does not own the vain representations and figures of images."

He tells you, that Helen worshipped Jesus Christ, and not the wood of his cross, which she had found; for that is a Pagan error, and a vanity of ungodly men. Conc. de Obitu Theodosii. He maintains, that it is pure Paganism to worship stones, and to implore the assistance of images, that have no understanding. Lib. 1. de Offic. c. 26.

Do we suppose he attributed to ministers the power of pardoning sins? We may undeceive ourselves, by hearing him deliver himself like a Protestant, thus: "Men afford their ministry for the remission of sins, but do not exercise the right of any power; they pray, but God pardons." L. 3. de Spir. Sancto, c. 18.

He asserts, that the ministry may be in the hands of heretics, and this without corrupting the faith of the people, the ears of the people being more wise than the mouth of the preachers; as happened at the time when Arianism seemed to prevail. In Psalm. cxviii. Sermon. 17.

He sets down for a certain maxim, that we are bound to separate ourselves from a Church that rejects the faith, and does not possess the foundation of the preaching of the Apostles. Lib. 6. in Lucam, c. 9.

We may see, that he was wholly estranged from that maxim which the Papists have maintained these last six hundred years, that the Church hath the power of deposing a prince who is turned heretic; for he maintains, that the Church has no other. arms but prayers and remonstrances, or at the most excommunications.

I pass on to Philastrius Bishop of Brescia, contemporary with St. Ambrose, from whose writings we may gather these following particulars. He did not believe that the Church of Rome could authorize the Canon of Scripture, as the Gloss maintains; for he asserts, that the Apostles and their successors determined the number of the canonical books, which only ought to be read in the Church. Haer. 40.

It is plain, he did not believe the Church of Rome to be exempt from error, if he minded what he said; because, Haeres. 41. he rejects as heretical the opinion of those who held the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been writ by Barnabas, by Clemens Romanus, or by St. Luke, which had given occasion to make the authority thereof suspected and doubtful in the Roman Church, which rejected the same. As we may see by the testimony of St. Jerome.

He did not believe, that it belonged only to the Church of Rome to condemn heresies, which power she arrogates to herself at this day; because he observes, concerning several heresies, that the particular Bishops or councils of the diocese, where the heresy first appeared, had right to condemn them.

So little did he think, that it was the right of the Church of Rome only to canonize the versions of Scripture by her authority, that he fixeth the brand of heresy upon the opinion of those who did not receive the version of the Septuagint; whereas it was the only version the Church admitted of in his time. Haeres. 89, 90. One may see by this, whether he was like to have rejected the same upon the Pope's determination.

We cannot find that he believed transubstantiation; for giving an account of the heresy of the Artotyrites, who celebrated the Eucharist with bread and cheese, he doth not, to condemn them, make use of the reasons which a transubstantiator might have alleged, Haeres. 27. And we ought to make the same reflection on the 30th heresy of the Aquarii, who celebrated the Eucharist with water only, which at least they might defend by way of concomitance; but might, on the other hand, be more strongly attacked, by the idolatry which would have been committed by adoring the water in the Sacrament.

He would never have employed, in defense of the real presence, the Acts of St. Andrew, which they nowadays object to us, to establish the carnal presence of Jesus Christ; forasmuch as he maintains, Haeres. 40. that those Acts had been feigned by the Manichees.

We find not, when he speaks of Aetius, Haeres. that he looked upon his opinion against prayers for the dead to be an heresy.

It is evident he did not approve of the principles of idol-worshippers, because he calls their opinion an heresy, who thought that man was the image of God, according to his body, and not according to his soul. Haeres. 49.

It appears from Haeres. 53. that he did not admit of the Romish divinity concerning the punishments, properly so called, which God, say they, makes his children to suffer during the course of this life.

He lays it down for a rule, Haeres. 60, 61. that the Christian faith is more ancient than the Jewish; which can no longer now be maintained, since the Church of Rome has been pleased to add so many articles to the Creed, and introduced into its worship so many practices contrary to the law of God.

He declares expressly, that the sacrifice of the Church is a sacrifice of bread in mysterium Christi, to be a mystery of Jesus Christ. Haeres. 96. He was so sensible, with the Protestants, that the children of believers

have a right to the covenant, that he maintains, Haeres. 69. that formerly the patriarchs, judges, and other believers, were sanctified in their mothers belly. A doctrine which has so extremely disgusted the Romish censors, that they thought fit to guard the margin with a *Caute lege*.

He asserts, Haeres. 74. that he who called upon the Father, before Christ's coming in the flesh, was thereby freed from the condemnation of the wicked; which does not seem to agree very well with the Popish doctrine of a *Limbus Patrum*; or else it must be owned, that the *Limbus* must take place as well under the New Testament, as under the Old: because he makes use of the words of Jesus Christ, or, at least, makes a plain allusion to them.

He overthrows the doctrine of merit, in maintaining, Haeres. 77. that it is by the sole mercy of Jesus Christ we are saved, *non virtute et justitia condigna*, "not by any condign virtue and righteousness of our own."

It does not appear that he owned a Purgatory, such as the Romanists do, because, Haeres. 73. he saith, that the soul of man, whether good or bad, whether godly or ungodly, is conducted by an angel to its appointed place, there to receive according to what he has done in this life. It is evident from the Epistle of St. Gaudentius to Benevolus, that he believed a fire, through which the most righteous, even the Apostles and blessed Virgin herself, were to pass, at the end of the world: which opinion has been since rejected in the west.

It appears from Haeres. 97. that the number of fasts was very small in his time; he takes notice only of four, that of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Whitsuntide, besides that of Lent; the rest were left to the devotion of believers: and there is great probability, that these fasts were only observed on the eves before the Communion.

True it is, that he speaks of a local descent of the soul of our Savior Jesus Christ into hell, Haeres. 22. but in Haeres. 73. he terms their opinion an heresy, who maintain, that after his death he descended into hell, and preached the Gospel, that the souls there receiving the same might be saved: which was the opinion of most of the ancients, both before and after him. Whence we may judge, whether this article, about which so much pains has been taken to explain it in a good sense, was a doctrine which the Apostles had left in the Church; or whether it was not drawn from some passages of Scripture, ill understood in the second century, as we assert, because the Fathers did not at all times, in all places, and with all agree therein; which is the character of a doctrine truly catholic, according to the famous maxim of Vincentius Lirinensis.

And forasmuch as St. Gaudentius succeeded Philastrius, whom he calls a most apostolical man, it is no wonder to find him so closely following his steps; for we find him every where of the same opinion with St. Gaudentius in the points he treats of, as I have already made it appear from his Epistle to Benevolus; for, writing to him a consolatory letter, upon occasion of his sickness, he treats the matter altogether like a Protestant, without mingling any Popish notions therewith, such as are the considering Of the afflictions of believers as punishments and satisfactions God exacts from them as a judge; as may be seen in that Epistle. It is true, that amongst other things he observes, that they serve also to lessen the force of the purgative fire of the last judgment. But I have showed what he meant by that; and the same is acknowledged by the learned of the Roman Church. He lays down two things in the same Epistle; the one is, that the bosom of Abraham signifies eternal life, which does no service to the Popish polemical writers; the other is, that neither angels nor men know the secrets of conscience, that being the privilege of God only; which maxim wholly overthrows the invocation of angels, as well as the authority the priests arrogate to themselves of pardoning sins, as judges. But we will pass on to his Sermons, and instance in some other of his opinions.

He tells us plainly in his first sermon, that we shall not eat the true manna, which is Jesus Christ, till after the resurrection in heaven, where we shall drink of the Rock, which is Jesus Christ, cleaving to the feet of that immaculate Lamb. Is this the language of a man that believes the carnal presence?

The whole of his second sermon is spent in explaining the doctrine of the Eucharist, where at the first he lays down, that the figure is not the truth, but an imitation of it. He saith, Jesus Christ has suffered death for all men, and that he feeds them in all the Churches: but how? In *mysterio panis et vini rescit*

immolatus, vivifcat creditus; "He refresheth, being offered up in the mystery of bread and wine; and quickens, being believed on:"

so that he is only offered up in figure, and not truly, and only quickens those that believe his word. And he explains himself, by declaring, that the doctrine of Jesus Christ is the flesh of that immaculate Lamb, the whole body of the Scriptures containing the Son of God. He explains that phrase, to receive the body of the Son of God, by receiving with the mouth the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord. He maintains, that it was of the consecrated bread that Jesus Christ said, This is my body; which, according to the doctors of Rome, overthrows transubstantiation. Lastly, he maintains, that Jesus Christ made choice of the bread and wine, to make them the sacraments of his body and blood, that there might be no blood in this new sacrifice, and to figure the body of the Church, which is composed of many believers, as the bread is made up of many grains. Can any thing be said more contrary to the maxims of the Church of Rome? In his third sermon he asserts, that the Church resembles the moon, which increases in times of peace, and decreaseth in times of persecution; that she decreaseth with respect to her fullness, but not with respect to her brightness. He seems after her fullness, to which she was arrived, to foresee her wane and decrease, which he had already had a view of, during the reign of Arianism.

CHAPTER 4

Concerning the faith of the Churches of the diocese of Italy during the fifth century

ONE of the most illustrious witnesses we have of the belief of the Churches of Italy, at the beginning of the fifth age, is Rufinus, Presbyter of Aquileia.

As for the rule of faith, which is the Scripture, Rufinus sets down a catalogue of the books of holy Writ, the same that is at present received by the Protestants, calling the books that we reject apocryphal, apud Cyr. p. 552 and 553. which is an evident mark, that the Church of Italy made a more accurate distinction of the canonical books from the apocryphal, than the Church of Rome at that time did. So that Rufinus, in this respect, knew more than Innocent I. who began to confound the canonical writings, by a mixture of the apocryphal.

As for the Creed, which is an abridgment of the articles of our belief, we cannot meet with a more orthodox explication of it than is that of Rufinus; and would to God the Church of Rome would keep to that, for then we should be soon agreed; at least, in so doing she would not propose any thing to Christians which was not owned for the Creed of the ancient Church; whereas since she has added new articles, altogether unknown to Rufinus and the Bishops of that diocese. In a word, we may say, it is most certain, that there is as much difference between this treatise of Rufinus and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as there is between the Catechism of the Protestants and that of the Papists.

I own, that Rufinus, in this explication of the Creed, asserts a local descent of Jesus Christ into hell: but we are to observe, that though already in his time this was looked upon as an article of faith; yet the Fathers, as well those that went before, as those that followed after, had such different notions concerning it, that the Church of Rome, which at this day follows one of those opinions, but had not that article in her Symbol in Rufinus's time, can scarcely draw any advantage from thence, except only against those who hold, that this article is only an allegorical explication of the article, He was buried.

But, however, we may observe, that Rufinus expressly notes, at the beginning of this his exposition of the Creed, that believers received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with an extraordinary respect, maxima cure observantia, but not worshipping it, as the Church of Rome does at this day.

Though we have no remains of St. Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, save only some commentaries and homilies; yet from thence we are sufficiently informed, how far his divinity differed from that which is now professed by the Church of Rome. He plainly asserts the perspicuity of the Scriptures, when he accuses the heretics and Jews of darkening it by their perverse explications. Serra. 2. p. 162. Accordingly he also maintains, that the Lord's Prayer contains all things necessary to salvation, p. 175. which is not very agreeable to the palate of the doctors of Rome, who furnish us with a far greater number. He asserts, that the prison from whence there is no coming out until the last farthing be paid, is hell, which does not at all suit with Popish purgatory, 166. Conformably to this, he lays down, that the afflictions which happen to the faithful, are either to correct their defects, or to try their faith, or to prepare them for glory; not a word concerning the use the Roman Church puts them to, viz. for the expiation of sin, and for a satisfaction properly so called. He acknowledges indeed, that the Christian Church is typified by a city situated upon a mountain; but we do not find him concluding from thence its equal visibility, no more than St. Ambrose. We are not to forget here, that St. Chromatius had so little deference for the authority of the Church of Rome, that Rufinus having been condemned by Pope Anastasius, because he seemed to favor the Origenists, St. Chromatius took no notice of this proceeding, but received him to his communion, as before; an abundant testimony that the thunderbolts of Rome, at that time, reached no further than the ten provinces in subjection to the Pope, St. Chromatius's bishopric being without them, and consequently, that he did not own the Pope for the head of the Church, out of whose communion salvation was not to be hoped for.

He plainly asserts, that marriage is so wholly dissolved by adultery, that it is lawful for the innocent party to marry again: which was the opinion of the Romish Church till after the tenth century, p. 168. A.B. He maintains it to be a piece of impiety, to swear by any creatures; which is not the faith of Rome at this day, p. 169. A. He owns no other union in the Church, but the unity of the Catholic faith, *ibid.* p. 158. We find, by all his expressions, that the carnal presence was unknown to him: First, he proposeth Jesus Christ as the meat and drink of the believer, that comes hungry to it. *Cortc.* 2. p. 157. Secondly, he holds, that a change is made when *ex eo quod fuit in aliam speciem generatur*; "out of that which was before, a thing of another kind is generated."

Thirdly, he applies, p. 174. our daily bread to the body of Jesus Christ, but he considers it spiritually, which makes it appear what notion he had of the manducation or eat-mg of it, and that the expression he useth of a *cotpore Domini separari*, signifies nothing else but the exclusion from the Sacrament.

Moreover, if we find that he has been a guide of the Waldenses towards truth, it will not be amiss withal to observe, that he seems to have suggested to them a wrong understanding of the Scripture. For this great man maintains, that the Gospel absolutely forbids swearing, p. 168. and the letter of Scripture so far imposed upon him, that he pretends we are obliged, according to the law of Jesus Christ, to offer the other cheek to him that has already struck us, p. 169, 170.

Niceas Bishop of Aquileia, who lived anno 420. has a very remarkable expression in his book *ad Virginem lapsam*, which we find in the works of St. Ambrose. "Stick close to the exercise of repentance, till the end of thy life, and never think of obtaining pardon *ab humano die*, because he who has made thee make this promise has deceived thee. As thou hast properly sinned against the Lord, so seek thy remedy only at his hands."

It is evident, that these words either are the expressions of a downright Novatian, which we cannot suspect him of, after the many testimonies we have of his soundness in the faith, or that they represent a very different notion from what has been entertained at Rome, since their espousing the secret of auricular confession, and the priestly power of pardoning sins, as judges properly so called.

The remaining part of this century was terribly agitated by the disputes raised upon occasion of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, insomuch as the Bishops were all divided, and the Council of Chalcedon was unable to appease their differences. The diocese of Italy was at the same time ravaged by the Huns. Attila rased Aquileia, destroyed Milan, Pavia, and diverse other places. Some years after, Odoacer invaded the said diocese; and not long after, the Goths marched through it under the command of Theodoric, so that scarcely was there any place left for learned men to write, during the inundation of these barbarous nations. Proceed we therefore to the following century.

CHAPTER 5

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the sixth century

One of the first that can give us any information herein is Laurentius, who was translated from the bishopric of Novara to that of Milan, about the year 507, We have three of his pieces, which he reached upon his return to his see, after the destruction of Milan, and his own banishment.

The first is a sermon upon the Canaanitish woman, his design therein being to administer comfort to repenting sinners, and to assure them of the easiness of God's mercy. Mabillon, who published them, tells us as much. I shall set down some of his propositions or doctrines which he borrowed from St. Chrysostom.

I. He requires nothing as necessary for the re-mission of sin, save only a lively compunction, without so much as one word of the Priest's absolution, p. 24. *Sed dicis, Feci peccata multa et magna: Et quis est de hominibus qui non peccet? Tu dic; Erravi super omnes homines, sufficit mihi in sacrioquio ista confessio. Dic tu prius iniquitates tuas, ut justiferceris: cognosce quoniam peccator es; babe tristitiam cure converteris; esto ac si desperatus et moestus, sed et lachrymas compunctus effunde. Numquid aliud aliquid fuit in meretrice, quam lachrymarum effusio? et ex hac profusione invenit presidium, et accepta fiducia accessit ad fontem Dominum Jesum.* "But thou wilt say, I have committed many and great sins: and who is there amongst men that sinneth not? Say thou, I have sinned beyond all men; this confession is sufficient to me, for a sacrifice. Do thou first declare thy iniquities, that thou mayest be justified; acknowledge thyself to be a sinner: be full of sorrow in this thy conversion; yea, be grieved, and as without hope: moreover, pour forth tears of compunction. Do you find ought else in her that had been a common harlot, but shedding of tears? and by this her weeping she found help; and having received confidence, she drew near to the fountain, our Lord Jesus."

He answers the unworthiness of sinners in these words, p. 25. *Et quomodo ausa est mulier legis ignara, tam iniqua, sic abrupte accedere ad fontem salutis? Non petiit Jacobum, non rogavit Johannem, non accessit ad Petrum; sed hoc intermittens, quid dicit? Non est mihi necessarius fidejussor: suscipit in se poenitentiae patrocinium, et sola currit, tenet eum in voce ac dicit, Miserere mei Domine fili David. Ideo descendisti, ideo carnem suscepisti, ut et ego loquar ad te et cure fiducia petam,* etc. "But how durst a woman ignorant of the law, and besides so wicked, so abruptly draw near to the fountain of salvation? she did not entreat James, nor ask John, neither came she to Peter [to speak for her.] But leaving all this, what saith she? I have no need of a sponsor. And taking upon herself the patronage of her own repentance, she runs to him alone, stops him with her voice, and saith, Lord have mercy upon me, thou Son of David. Therefore it is that thou camest down [to us,] therefore thou tookest flesh upon thee, that even I also might speak to thee, and with confidence ask of thee, etc."

See here a very exact imitation of St. Chrysostom, after Nectarius had taken away the use of penitentiary Priests. It is worth our taking notice how he speaks of prayers without attention, p. 35. *Sunt multi quidera qui intrant in ecclesiam, et strepunt in oratione, confuse atque intemperata voce dispergunt verba sua, et egressi foras obliti sunt omnia. Hi sunt qui labils hinnunt, et corde non concipiunt. Si tu ipse dicta tua et preces ignoras; quomodo te exaudit Deus?* "There be many indeed that come into the church, and make a noise in prayer, scattering their words with a confused and rude bawling, who as soon as they are got abroad, quite forget all. These are they who neigh with their mouths, without conceiving in their hearts. If thou thyself dost not know what thou sayest or prayest, how shall God hear thee?"

From whence we may easily judge how he would have approved of praying in an unknown tongue, which necessarily destroys attention. As concerning the place where we ought to pray, that we may be heard, he expresseth himself in this manner, as if he had designed to furnish the Waldenses with an answer, p. 36. *Grandis sermo est, Miserere mei Deus, brevis quidera sed virtute plenus. Nam et si foris fueris, clama et dic, Miserere mei Deus. Clama, non voce, sed mente; nam et tacentes exaudit Deus. Nec tam locus*

queeritur, quantum sensus. Hieremias in careere conbrtatur; Daniel inter leones exultat; tres pueri in fomace tripudiant; Job nudus sub divo triumphat; Paradisum de cruce latro invenit. Quid ergo si fueris in publico foro? Ora intra te. Noli queerere locum, locus ipse es, ibi ubi fueris ora. Si fueris in balneo, ora, et ibi ternplum est. "This is a great word, Lord have mercy upon me; short indeed, but full of virtue. For though thou art abroad, yet cry and say, Lord have mercy upon me. Cry, not with thy voice, but with thy mind, for God hears even those that are silent; neither does he regard the place where, but our mind and attention in prayer. Jeremiah receives comfort in the dungeon; Daniel rejoiceth in the lions' den; the three young men leap in the midst of the fiery furnace; Job, naked and destitute, triumphs in the open air; the thief finds a Paradise upon the cross. What therefore, though thou art in the public market? pray within thyself; do not seek for another place, thou thyself art a place; wheresoever therefore thou art, there pray. If thou be in the bath, pray there, for there also is the church." And p. 37. *Nunquid homo est Deus, ut labore quceratur per loca diversea? Deus est qui adest ubique? Si quaeris hominem, dicitur tibi non est hic, aut non illic vacat : non est sic in causa Dei; hoc tantum est ut dicas, Miserere mei Deus, et ipse prope est ut te liberet, et adhuc loquente te dicit, Ecce adsum.* "What! is God a man then that thou must take pains to seek him in several places? It is God who is present every where. If indeed thou chancest to look for a man, thou art answered, He is not here, or he is not at leisure: but the case is not so with God.: Do thou only say, Lord have mercy upon me, and he is near thee to deliver thee, and whilst thou art yet speaking, saith to thee, Behold, here am I."

The second homily published in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, t. 3. utterly overthrows the pretended tribunal of penance, p. *Mox ut ascendisti de fonte, vestitus es veste alba, et unctus es unguento mystico; facta est super te invocatio, et venit super te trina virtus, quam vas novum hac nova perfundit doctrina, exinde teipsum tibi statuit judicem et arbitrum.* "As soon as thou art come up from the fountain, thou art clothed with white raiment, and anointed with the mystical ointment; prayers have been made over thee, and the threefold virtue is come upon thee; after that thy new vessel is once filled with this new doctrine, thenceforward he has constituted thee a judge and disposer for thyself."

In the third homily, which treats of alms, he makes use of this expression; In *Jordane Christus semel tinctus, sanctificavit aquas; in pauperibus autem semper manet, et assidue abluit crimina largientium.* "Christ being once dipped in the river Jordan, thereby sanctified the waters; but he always abides in the poor, and continually washeth away the sins of those that give to them."

This notion of the presence of Jesus Christ in the poor sufficiently makes out the sense of the Fathers, when they speak Of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist; especially if we join with it that expression of his second homily, p. 127. B. *Asperges me aqua Filii tui sacro sanguine mixta.* "Thou wilt sprinkle me with the water mingled with the holy blood of thy Son."

The opinions of Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, are evident in several of his works; we shall instance the following places.

We find in the Life of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Pavia, writ by Ennodius, a representation of the manner how that Bishop did celebrate the Eucharist, which makes it apparent how far he was from adoring the Eucharist as his God. *Junctis pedibus usque ad consummationem mystici operis stare se debere constituit, ita ut humore vestigiorum locum suum depingeret, et longe aspicientibus indicaret.* "He had purposed with himself," saith he, "always to stand still, with his feet together, till he had finished that mystical work, so that the moisture of his footsteps deciphered the place of his standing, and might be seen by those who were at a considerable distance."

It is but too visible here, that St. Epiphanius and Ennodius knew nothing of those prostrations which now are used before the Sacrament; because the one of them prescribed this constant form to himself, in celebrating the Eucharist; and the other commends him for it, as a mark of his piety. At the end of the said Life, Ennodius gives us an account of the death of St. Epiphanius, much like that of a Protestant Bishop. He had only this word in his mouth, *Mihi vivere Christus est, et mori lucrum*; "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

He was heard to repeat nothing but Psalms of consolation, such as the eighty-eighth Psalm; and he breathed his last in these words, *In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum*; "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit;"

taken out of Psalm 30. He tells us in plain terms, that his soul returned to heaven, *ad sedem suam coelestis anima remeavit*; "his heavenly soul returned to its own place."

All which serves to make out, that prayer for the dead had not as yet the belief of purgatory for its foundation, as it hath at this day.

And it was in the same mind that he composed the epitaph of St. Victor, Bishop of Noarre, where we read these verses: *Hic reddens tumulis cineres, ad celsa vocatus Spiritus, aetherea congaudet lucidus arce.*

"Having bequeath'd his dust to dust,
His soul is call'd on high;
There bright and glorious, to partake
Those joys which never die."

And forasmuch as we see that he in diverse places; commends St. Ambrose and his successors for orthodox Bishops, I shall not trouble myself to quote any more of his writings; and the rather, because the most part of his works were letters or poems, relating rather to outward affairs than any matters of religion.

I know they are wont to cite a passage of Ennodius, to prove that the Pope cannot be judged by any one but God. We find nothing more frequent since the time of Gratian and the canonists, than to quote these words of his Apology for Symmachus; *Aliorum hominum causas Deus voluit per homines terminari, sed Romanos sedis prossulem, suo, sine quæstione, reservavit arbitrio.* "Other men's cases God was willing should be determined by men, but as for the Bishop of Rome, he has reserved his case for his own cognizance, without exposing it to a judicial trial."

But they signify nothing less, than what they seem to express thus separate from the rest of the discourse. What Ennodius by these terms would declare, is simply this; that Pope Symmachus's adversaries, not having been able to convince him of the horrible crimes whereof they had accused him before king Theodoric, and afterwards before the synod assembled by Theodoric, for examining his accusation, his case had been remitted to the judgment of God, as was customary, when persons could not be convicted by the ordinary course of judiciary proceedings. De Launoy hath so solidly proved that this was Ennodius's meaning, though of a long time it hath been disguised, that there is no need to insist further upon it. T. 1. Epist. 9.

Dacius, Bishop of Milan, has left so little in writing, that it may seem needless to speak of it; only it may be to the purpose to observe the carriage of Justinian towards him, who, finding him at Constantinople, would make him (as well as the Pope's referendary) subscribe the edict which he had published: which shows that he looked upon himself as the head of a diocese, which was as exempt and separate from the Pope of Rome's jurisdiction, as the dioceses of the Patriarchs of the East were. Baronius ad annum 546. Section. 46.

In the year 590 the Bishops of Italy and of the Grisons, to the number of nine, rejected the Communion of the Pope, as of an heretic, who had consented to the abolishing of the Council of Chalcedon, consenting under Justinian to the condemnation of the three chapters, as may be seen from their letter to the Emperor Mauritius, set down by Baronius, ad h. annum, n. 29. That Emperor having ordered them to be present at the Council of Rome, they were dispensed with by the same Emperor, upon their protesting that they could not communicate with Pope Gregory the First. This schism had already continued from the year 553, and lasted near as long after; so little were they persuaded at that time of the Pope's infallibility, that to lose communion with them was to lose the communion of the Church, or that they held their ordinations from the hand of the Popes, and from the Bishops, subjected to their jurisdiction. Let us proceed now to the belief of the following century.

CHAPTER 6

Opinions of the diocese of Italy during the seventh century

I know only of two or three authors that can instruct us in this matter; the one is Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna, who flourished in the midst of the seventh century; the other Mansuetus, Bishop of Milan, who flourished towards the end of it, viz. from the year 677. Of the first of these we have an Epistle against the Monothelites, which has been inserted in the Council of Lateran, under Martin the First, in the year 649. Act. I. Of the second we have an Epistle to the Emperor Constantine, set down in the same Council. The union of them both with the Bishops of Rome, for the defense of the faith against the Monothelites, is a strong assurance of their purity in the faith. Their opinions are these that follow.

Maurus, who styles himself *Servus servorum Dei*, precisely observes, that the Pope had invited him to be present at Rome at the council, but as a Bishop without his diocese; for otherwise he might, as being one of his suffragans, by his authority have summoned him thither. And indeed, instead of going to Rome in person, he sent in his place Maurus, Bishop of Cesena, with one of the Priests of Milan. *ibid* p. 601. He declares that the only means of preserving the purity of the faith is, to keep to the doctrine of the Apostles, which the Fathers had followed, with respect had to the fifth general Council. The words he useth are these, T. 6. Conc. p. 96. *Unicum omnibus et singulare est Redemptoris Dei, et Domini nostri Jesu Christi concessum remedium ad animarum nostrarum salutem, ut ea quae per Apostolorum praedicationem percepimus, et Patrum doctrinam, proculdubio teneamus.* "The only and particular remedy granted to all for the salvation of our souls, by God our Redeemer, and the Lord Jesus Christ, is, that, without all doubt, we hold fast the things we have received by the preaching of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the Fathers."

He declares that he owns and admits the five general Councils, and that he condemns that which was held at Constantinople in favor of the Monothelites, being supported by the credit of the emperors.

Maximus, Bishop of Aquileia, expresseth the same opinions; and moreover expressly condemns by name the Monothelite Bishops, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, p. 97.

Mansuetus, in his Epistle to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, declares, first, that it was Constantine the Great who convened the Council of Nice, which at this day is very stiffly contested by the Church of Rome; that the Emperor Theodosius called together the second Council of Constantinople; and that the Emperor Martianus did the same with regard to the Council of Chalcedon, and Justinian to the fifth general Council.

He declares, that the whole faith of his Church is contained in the Apostles' Creed; whereof the confession of faith by him sent to the Emperor is only an explication. Which makes it evident, that the Church of Milan, and his diocese, under the reigns of Pertharit and Cunibert, kings of the Lombards, did not own any other doctrine to belong to the faith and of necessary belief, save only what was contained in the Apostles' Creed; much less did his Church own that heap of doctrines which Pius the Fourth thought good of his own head to superadd to it.

True it is that he praiseth the ancient doctors of the Church, Leo I. St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, etc. *Quicquid hi docuerunt, saith he, sapuerunt, prosdicaverunt, vel defensores extiterunt, nos eorum acta vel statuta omni devotione suscipimus.* "Whatsoever they have taught, judged, preached, or defended, all that we received with all devotion."

Yet however this is not so general as it seems to be, because his words have a particular reference to their explications concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, against the heresies of the fourth and fifth century, which was the only matter in question then.

It is worth our while to take notice of the singular elogy he gives to St. Ambrose, whom he calls *Veneranda Corona Christi Confessor dembrosius Mediolanensis Ecclesios Preesul*; "The venerable Crown of Christ, Ambrosius the Confessor, Bishop of the Church of Milan."

What I have here mentioned of Mansuetus is the more considerable, because it was done by him presiding in the synod of his diocese. Lastly, We may observe that the deputies of Mansuetus condemned Honorius, Bishop of Rome, Act. 13. for being a Monothelite; and the matter at this time is no longer questioned, notwithstanding Baronius, and some after him, have endeavored to make it pass for doubtful: whence it appears that in Italy they held it for an inviolable maxim:

First, That the Pope was liable to become an heretic.

Secondly, That none were to continue in communion with him, save only so far as he continued united to Jesus Christ, as a true believer; so far were they from supposing themselves bound to cleave to the Church of Rome, as they would continue in the communion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But though we have but few particular authors that might inform us of the opinions and worship that took place in that diocese; yet have we something that seems more authentic, viz. the Liturgy which bears the name of St. Ambrose. And forasmuch as this piece was made use of before this century, and that since that time it has served for a model of the devotion of that diocese, it will be of some importance carefully to examine the same, and the rather, because though I speak of it only in this place, yet the observations drawn from thence may and ought to be applied to the foregoing ages, as well as those that follow after.

CHAPTER 7

Some Refections upon the Liturgy of this Diocese, called the Ambrosian Liturgy.

One of the most certain ways to be informed concerning the faith of a Church, is to consult her Liturgy. I am not ignorant that what Josephus Vicecomes tells us concerning the antiquity of the Ambrosian Liturgy, viz. that St. Barnabas was the author of it, that it was afterwards augmented by Merocles; and lastly, having been revised by St. Ambrose, it obtained the name of Ambrosian, is absolutely false, and so ridiculous a conceit, that it is wholly rejected by Cardinal Bona. Neither am I ignorant that the miracle related by Durandus, Rational. Offic. 1. v. c. 2. as of the life of St. Eugenius, concerning the Ambrosian Office, is just such another story, which deserves no manner of credit, notwithstanding that Ripomontius has endeavored to maintain it. But however we cannot deny the truth of what follows.

First, That this Liturgy has the Psalms, and diverse other texts of Scripture of the ancient version called the Italic.

Secondly, That Walafrius Strabo, who lived in the midst of the ninth century, has cited this Liturgy under the name of the Liturgy of St. Ambrose.

Indeed it seems very probable, that as several centuries before the ninth they had in diverse dioceses fixed a form of Divine service, to be observed in the respective Churches of the same diocese; whereas before, viz. in the fourth and fifth century, every Bishop had the liberty of prescribing the form himself; so that of Milan conformed to the same rule, and the name of St. Ambrose was made use of by posterity, as being so very famous, and because that St. Ambrose had probably dictated several of the Collects therein contained; much in the same manner as in the east they have given the name of the Liturgy of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom to the Liturgies which were made use of in the dioceses where these great men once flourished.

It is true, we have not this Liturgy now, preserved to us exactly as it was used in the primitive centuries: it has been variously changed by the rashness of those who succeeded those primitive authors, which has also happened to the greatest part of these works; as is acknowledged by Cardinal Bona and Mabillon. It is likewise true, that since the Popes have been sovereigns of the west, they have, by themselves or by their creatures, brought in a vast number of variations in the books of the public Offices; which changes have been introduced with more ease, since the Latin began to be looked upon as a barbarous language.

We have an illustrious proof hereof in the Ambrosian Office for Good Friday, where we find a prayer for the consecrating of a cross, precedent to its adoration. For it is certain that Pope Adrian the First, who lived towards the end of the eighth century, declares that the Church did not consecrate any images; this being a practice that was introduced long after: and we find in the life of St. Lewis a complaint of that prince concerning this subject; whence it appears that these prayers must needs have been of a very late date.

We have another example hereof, which cannot be disputed; it is in the Canon, where we find at present, these words, *pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt.*, whereas those words *pro quibus tibi offerimus* were foisted in the thirteenth century, as Hugo Menardus doth ingenuously acknowledge upon the book of the Sacraments of St. Gregory. This addition was made after that the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass was received; and indeed it was altogether necessary, since without it there could be no oblation made by the Priest in that pretended sacrifice, which was looked upon as a capital inconvenience.

A third proof hereof we have in the feast of St. Barnabas, who is accounted the first Bishop of Milan, and to whom they attribute the cursing of the heathen temple at Milan, whereupon a part thereof fell down, and crushed several of the idolaters under its ruins, which is a story drawn from legends of no ancient standing.

But after all it is easy to prove that this Liturgy was not at first tainted with any of those errors, wherewith it was filled in the following ages, and in particular since the twelfth century, towards the end of which the

Popes took care to change or abrogate all Liturgies whatsoever, that instead thereof that of Rome might be introduced; following therein the spirit of Pope Adrian, who had begun this work, being supported therein by the favor of the Emperor Charles the Great, who first introduced this spirit of change.

First of all then I maintain that this Liturgy had none of the Confiteor of the Priest, as we find it at this day in the Roman missal, which Confiteor is at this day made to the blessed Virgin, angels and saints, as well as to God. Now it is certain that this custom is only of late ages: we have an undoubted proof hereof in the Confiteor set down by Chrodegandus, Bishop of Metz, who lived in the time of Pepin, father of Charles the Great. *Regule Canoniorum*, cap. 18. *Ad primam Clero congregato donant confessiones, suas vicissim dicentes, Confiteor Domino et tibi frater quod peccavi.* "At the first canonical hour the Clergy being assembled, they make their mutual confessions, saying, I confess to the Lord, and thee my brother, that I have sinned."

It is necessary to observe here,

1st, That this rule, for the most part of it, is borrowed from that of St. Bennet, who lived in the Pope's diocese.

Secondly, That the same has been almost wholly transcribed in the Acts of the Council of Aix la Chapelle, in the year 816.

Thirdly, That these confessions to the Virgin, the angels and saints, are not found in any of the ancient forms of confession, whereof we have a considerable number, which may be seen in the notes of Hugo Menardus upon the book of the Sacrament of St. Gregory, p. 224. et seq.

Secondly, I maintain that there was nothing in this Liturgy which implied any direct invocation of the saints, but only it supposeth that they intercede for the Church. We own, that since the fourth century the Church has avowedly demanded several favors of God by the intercession of saints; but we do not find that they prayed directly to them. It is true there are several passages in this Liturgy, wherein favors are begged of God *per preces et merita sanctorum*, by the prayers and merits of the saints. But the word merit, then, contains nothing that can offend us, if we take it in the sense of the primitive Church, as signifying nothing else but godliness. There are a thousand passages that prove this invincibly, as well in St. Ambrose, as in those authors that have succeeded him: and in this Liturgy by merit and to merit the Church did not pretend to obtain by way of justice, but only to obtain in general, as when we read in the Roman office, *O felix culpa, quoe tantam recruit sattem!*

"O happy fault, which procured so great salvation!"

Thirdly, I maintain that we find therein no other oblation of the bread and wine to God in the action of the Sacrament, but the oblation of the bread and wine to the Priest who officiated, which even to this day is yet practiced by some men and women at Milan, according to the account given us thereof by Cardinal Bona and Mabillon; for otherwise this was absolutely impossible, because the expression of *pro quibus offerimus*, p. 301. made use of by the Priest to denote his action, was never put into the Roman missal until the thirteenth century, as Menardus, a learned Benedictine, doth own. Secondly, Because this notion of offering the Sacrament for a propitiatory sacrifice, is a thing even unknown to the most ancient of the Schoolmen, as our Divines have sufficiently proved from their silence on that question. And certainly this is so strange a notion, that in consequence of it we must hold, that Jesus Christ is sacrificed and offered up to himself; for we find in the prayers of St. Anselm, falsely attributed to St. Ambrose, these expressions, which are very singular, p. 175. *Ut offeram tibi sacrificium quod instituisti, et offerri praecepisti in commemorationem tui pro salute nostra: suscipe vero istud, quaeso, summe Deus, dilectissime Jesu Christe, pro Ecclesia tua sancta.* "That I may offer to thee the sacrifice thou hast instituted, and commanded to be offered in remembrance of thee, for our salvation: receive it, most high God, dearest Jesus Christ, we beseech thee, for thy holy Church."

It was necessary for them to change their words, after they had changed their opinion. It was only the belief of transubstantiation, that made way for the belief of a sacrifice properly so called, as the Church of Rome

believes at this day. Now it is commonly enough known, that the Romish Church has hatched that article herself; and the history of this change is so exactly set down, that it is needless to make any stop at it.

Fourthly, This innovation can be demonstratively proved, from this Ambrosian Liturgy alone. And not to mention now, that it contained no office for the Fridays in Lent, which shows, that at that time they believed that the receiving of the Sacrament was a breaking of the fast; upon which account also they call it *vitalia alimenta*, "food of life," and wholly overthrows the notion of transubstantiation.

We find there also this prayer for the Post communion, p. 310. *Pignus vitae aeternae capientes, humiliter to, Domine, imploramus, ut apostolicis fultis patrocinis, quod in imagine contigimus Sacramenti, manifesta perceptione sumamus.* "Having received this pledge of eternal life, we humbly beseech thee, O Lord, that being assisted with apostolical suffrages, what we have now touched in the image of the Sacrament, we may by manifest perception take and receive."

This prayer is found in the missal of Gelasius, and in other ancient missals. Now, according to the observation of Ratramnus, that which is a pledge and image, is so of another thing different from itself.

We find there the Communion under both kinds, p. 207. as well as the preservation of those two kinds, and their mixture, p. 304. in such a manner as quite overthrows the notion of concomitance received in the Church of Rome.

We meet there also with this prayer, *Hanc oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo, per manus angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel*, etc. "Receive this offering on thy high altar, from the hands of thy angels, as thou wast pleased to receive the gifts of thy servant righteous Abel." p. 302, 303. Which clauses have made the Schoolmen to sweat blood and water, in endeavoring to reconcile them with the notion of the real presence.

We find there also this prayer, which absolutely decides the question, *Aeterne Deus, suppliciter implorantes, ut Filius tuus Jesus Christus, qui se in fine seculi suis promisit fidelibus affuturum, et praesentiae corporalis mysteriis, non deserat quos redemit, et majestatis suae beneficiis non relinquat.* "Beseeching thee, O eternal God, that thy Son Jesus Christ, who has promised to be with believers to the end of the world, may not forsake those he has redeemed, with respect of the mysteries; he may not deprive those whom he has redeemed, of the mysteries of his corporal presence, nor leave them destitute of the blessings of his majesty."

It seems evident, that these words, "the mysteries of his bodily presence," signify plainly, that Jesus Christ is absent, with respect to his flesh, though his body be present in its image, which represents it to us.

It is commonly supposed, from the testimony of the books of the Sacraments attributed to St. Ambrose, that the Ambrosian Liturgy had this clause: *Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* "Make this offering to be imputed to us, reasonable and acceptable, which is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

And indeed, though the word figure be not found now in Pamelius's edition of the Ambrosian Liturgy; nevertheless, first, we find, that by a marginal note he refers his reader to St. Ambrose himself, de Sacram. lib. 5. cap. 5. Secondly, Pamelius, in his 60th title, where he sets down the words of consecration, cites the place of St. Ambrose with the word *Sigura*. Thirdly, we find it so in the edition of St. Ambrose, printed at Paris in the year 1529. The words are these: *Vis scire quia verbis crelestibus consecratur, accipe quae sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos, Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem et acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* This passage has been corrupted in other editions; but Paschasius's quoting of it in the year 835, in his treatise of the body and blood of our Lord, confounds the authors of this falsification. But to speak the truth, as I do not believe that these books of the Sacraments were written by St. Ambrose, though Mabillon assures us that they have been found at St. Gall, under his name; so neither have I any certainty that this prayer was taken out of the Office or Liturgy of St. Ambrose. What passages I have already cited are sufficient to show, that the carnal presence was not then

believed by the diocese of Italy. They who are willing to examine the said Liturgy will find many other passages in it, that do invincibly confirm the same truth.

By this we may judge what likelihood there is of finding any thing in this Liturgy concerning the adoration of the Host after consecration: indeed, we are so far from finding any such thing there, that we meet with no hint thereof even in the ages after Paschasius; of which we can give a demonstrative proof, viz. that whereas at this day use is made of the adoration of the Host to prove the real presence, none of those that disputed against Berengarius for almost an hundred years together, did mention one word of that proof, which should clearly make out, that Berengarius and Scotus were innovators, by opposing themselves to a belief, which served for a foundation to establish a worship, which the Church had publicly owned and practiced.

I say nothing here concerning that clause made use of in the Ambrosian Liturgy, wherein they pray for the dead, that "sleep the sleep of peace." Thus much is evident, that that prayer is as contrary to the notion of purgatory, as those we find in the Roman Liturgy; as our authors, and Blondel in particular, have showed. The prayer for the dead, p. 298. which that Liturgy contains, was founded upon other principles than those which the doctors of Rome at this day admit of; as hath been made out from the confessions of the learned men of that communion themselves. The substance of these prayers is, that *fidelibus vita mutatur, non tollitur, et in timoris Dei observantia defunctis domicilium perpetuae foelicitatis acquiritur*. "As to believers, their life [by death] is only changed, not taken away, and that the deceased, who have lived in the observance of the fear of God, do acquire a mansion of perpetual felicity," as we find the words in the prayer for many souls, p. 451. Not to insist now, that in the next following prayer the bosom of Abraham is taken for the state of glory; which the Church of Rome contradicts and rejects at present.

I own, that in the Ambrosian Liturgy, p. 341. we find the anointing of the sick and possessed persons mentioned, but only with reference to the obtaining the remission of their sins, and their cure; which cannot be the Roman unction. We find there this clause: *Concede infusione Sancti Spiritus, olim tibi placitam, praesentis old confirmes, nobilitesque sub-stantiam, ut quicquid ex eo in humano genere tacturn fuerit, ad naturam transeat mox supernam*. "Grant by the infusion of the Holy Spirit, so to strengthen and enrich the substance of this present oil, formerly accepted of by thee, that whosoever of the race of mankind shall therewith be touched, may immediately be exalted to the nature that is from on high."

What we meet with there likewise concerning the consecration of the chrism used in Confirmation, contains nothing that can give us much trouble. We acknowledge that it is a ceremony which has been practiced since the fourth century, as an appendix to Baptism; neither do we look upon that ceremony as blameworthy, but only so far as the Church of Rome has pretended to make a sacrament of it, properly so called, and thereby to make a ceremony, introduced by men, equal to that which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ himself. And I have the same thing to say concerning the benediction of the fire and the wax candles at Easter, the benediction of the fonts, and some other ceremonies we meet with there.

Moreover, we find there, as well as in the Roman Liturgy, a prayer wherein remission of sins is begged of God, calling him *non estimator meriti, sed venice donator*; "not a regarder of merit, but a giver of pardon?" which expression one of the most famous Schoolmen has looked upon as absolutely contrary to the doctrine of merit, as it is held at present. So likewise, p. 298. we find these words, *Iniquitates meas ne vespexeris, sed sola tua misericordia mihi prosit indigno*; "Do not thou regard mine iniquities, but let thy alone mercy help me unworthy."

After all, we must continually remember, that this piece comes from very suspected hands. Pamelius, who is the first that has printed it, confesseth himself to have cut off a great part of it, which he pretends indeed to have done only to avoid repetition: but it is well known, that these sort of works must be very exactly inspected, to be well assured of the force of the expressions therein contained, and to be able to pass a certain judgment concerning them. I return now to the method I have prescribed to myself.

CHAPTER 8

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the eighth century.

We may be informed concerning the state of these Churches, first by the Council of Forojulio, wherein no other Creed is prescribed to the people, but that of the Apostles, nor any other prayer, but the Lord's Prayer; by which, in abstaining from wicked works, men may certainly arrive at salvation. Secondly, by their Bishops assisting at the Council of Francfort, in the year 794. which was a synod of the western Church. Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, who was present there, wrote at the same time a book against the doctrine of Foelix, Bishop of Urgel, and Elipandus, Bishop of Toledo, who maintained the opinions of Nestorius. It appears, that he wrote this book by the order of Charles the Great, during the session of that council. He plainly asserts, in this writing, first, that the Bishops were convened there by the orders of Charles the Great; he knew not that it belonged to the Pope alone to regulate matters of faith, and assemble councils. Secondly, that what he attributes to the Church, that she cannot be overcome by heresies, which are the gates of hell, has reference only to the universal Church, very far from attributing this privilege to the Popes, as being the successors of St. Peter. Thirdly, that this Council did not expect their authority from the Pope's confirmation; since they maintain, that Foelix and Elipandus ought to be excommunicated post plenariae synodi judicium, "upon judgment passed by a full council."

I acknowledge, that he seems to give great deference to the authority of Pope Adrian, when he saith, that the followers of Foelix and Elipandus ought to be excommunicated with their masters, *Reservato per omnia juris privilegio summi pontificis domini et patris nostri, Adriani, prims sedis beatissimi Papae*; "The rightful privileges of the high priest our lord and father Adrian, the most blessed Pope of the principal see, being always reserved entire."

But it is plain, that he makes use of this condescension for no other reason, but because Charles the Great had desired him to consult Pope Adrian upon so important a question; though indeed, the excommunication being already pronounced, this, after all, could be nothing more than a ceremony, or at the most a wise precaution, to hinder the Pope from engaging himself with a bad party.

We have a certain proof hereof, from the manner how Paulinus and the Bishops of Italy did agree to condemn the definitions of the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, as idolatrous definitions, notwithstanding that Pope Adrian had assisted at that Council by his legates, and though he did his utmost endeavors to maintain them. All authors of the ninth century, and next following, do unanimously testify, that the Council of Francfort, where Paulinus and his fellow deputies of the diocese of Italy were present, did condemn the second Council of Nice, notwithstanding that Theophylact and Stephen, the Pope's legates, assisted at it. We may easily conceive from hence what was the judgment of the Bishops of Italy, with reference to the Pope, and those that joined with him: if they held any communion with the Pope, they did it only with design to bring him back again to the truth; so that they acted conformably to the opinion of the Bishops of France, which is expressed by Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, upon the same occasion, lib. 1. p. 539. and 540. notwithstanding Jonas pronounceth anathema against those that worship images.

I shall say nothing concerning the exhortation which St. Paulinus addresseth to the Bishops, towards the end of his book, that they would pray to God, by the intercession of the holy Virgin and St. Peter, the first pastor of the Church, and of all saints, and by the suffrages of the Council, to defend the Emperor; for we find, after all, that this is only a wish founded on this supposal, that saints, after death, may pray for the welfare of the living; which seems probable enough.

We find also what was the doctrine of Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, in the book he wrote against Foelix, Bishop of Urgel, at the request of Charles the Great. See how he expresseth himself concerning the Eucharist, in his dedication to Charles the Great, p. 1766, etc. *initio*. He affirms, that the Eucharist consists of bread; he calls it, *buccella et particula panis*, "a morsel and bit of bread,"

he maintains, that it is either death or life in the mouth of him that eats it, according as he hath or hath not faith: than which nothing could be spoke more clear, to prove that the Eucharist is nothing but bread and substance, and that faith or incredulity makes all the difference that is found amongst communicants.

He refers and applies the character of priest, according to the order of Melchizedeck, to the incarnation and cross of Jesus Christ, and not to the sacrifice of the Mass. He thunders out anathemas against all human satisfactions; maintaining, that the blood of none of those that have been redeemed themselves is capable to blot out the least sin, and that that is the privilege of our Savior Jesus Christ alone, p. 1792.

He lays it down as a rule, that the human nature, in Christ is so circumscribed, as to be only in one place, p. 1833. *Natura namque altera, hoc est hominis, erat in terra tantummodo; altera ubique in caelo et in terra, hoc est divina. Potuit ergo, quod duo erant, divinum sc. et humanum, aliud in caelo et ubique esse, et aliud in terra solummodo. Non tamen potuit ille qui unus erat, Filius videlicet Dei et hominis, non torus ubique esse, in caelo pariter et in terra. Ubique sane torus quia unus est et omnipotens Deus; unus idemque omnipotentis Dei, et hominis Filius. Humana namque natura non descendit, nec fuit ibi priusquam, in Deum assumpta, ascenderet corporaliter in coelum. Filius autem hominis quia unus idemque ipse est Filius Dei, et de coelo descendit, unde nunquam discesserat, et in caelo erat, cure loqueretur in terra; et in terram venit ubi erat, et in coelum ascensurus erat per id quod homo est, et ibi ascendit ubi erat prius, per id quod Deus est. Domini namque sunt verba dicentis, Nemo ascendit in coelum, nisi qui descendit de caelo, Filius hominis qui est in caelo.*

"One of his natures, the human, was only upon earth: the other, that is, the Divine nature, was every where, both in heaven and on earth: wherefore, because these were two natures, viz. the Divine and human, the one of them could be in heaven, and every where, and the other only on earth. Yet notwithstanding, he who was the only Son both of God and man, could not but be wholly every where, both in heaven and on earth; whole every where, because he is the one and omnipotent God; one and God Almighty, and the one Son of Almighty God and man. For the human nature did not come down from heaven, neither was it there, till being taken up to God, it ascended corporally into heaven. And because the Son of man is one and the same with the Son of God, therefore he came down from heaven, from whence he never departed, and was in heaven while he spoke here upon earth; and he came down to the earth, where he was before, and was to ascend into heaven, as he was man, and as he was God, he ascended where he was before; for they are the words of our Lord, No man ascends up into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven."

Which is the same opinion we find expressed in the Council of Forojulio, in the year 791. in which Paulinus Bishop of Aquileia presided. T. 7. Conc. p. 1001.

He asserts, that in celebrating the Eucharist we feed upon the Divine nature of Jesus Christ, which cannot be said, but only with respect to believers, and must be understood metaphorically; which plainly shows what his belief was concerning the oral manducation of the body of Jesus Christ, p. 1836. *Vel qua ratione si adoptivus filius est, qui non manducat carnero filii hominis, et non bibit ejus sanguinem, non habet vitam aeternam? Oui manducat, it, quit, meum carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam aeternam, et ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die. Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Resuscitandi in novissimo die potestas nulli alio nisi veto permanet Deo. Cato namque et sauguis ad humanam, per quam Filius hominis est, non ad Divinam referri potest naturam. Et tamen si ille Filius hominis cui haec caro et sanguis est, pro eo quod unus idemque sit Dei et hominis Filius, si Deus verus non esset, caro ejus et sanguis manducantibus et bibentibus se, nullo modo vitam praestaret sternam. Unde et Johannes Evangelista ait, Et sanguis filii ejus lavat nos ab omni peccato. Aut cujus caro et sanguis dat vitam manducantibus et bibentibus se, nisi filii hominis, quem Deus signavit Pater, qui est verus et omnipotens Filius Dei? Nam et panis vivus pro nobis descendit de coelo, qui dat vitam mundo; quique ex eo manducaverit non moritur in aeternum: ipse enim dicit, Ego sum panis vivus, qui de coelo descendi. Sic quippe descendit panis vivus de coelo, qui semper manebat in coelo, sicut Filius hominis descendit de coelo, qui quoniam unus idemque erat Filius Dei, nunquam deseruit coelum.*

"Or how, if he be an adopted son only, is it said, that he who doth not eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, hath not eternal life? He that eats, saith he, my flesh, and drinks my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. The

power of raising up at the last day belongs to none, but the true God; for the flesh and blood cannot be referred to his Divine, but to his human nature, by which he is the Son of man: and yet, if that Son of man, whose this flesh and blood is, (for that one and the same person is both the Son of God and the Son of man,) were not true God, his flesh and blood could not procure eternal life to those that eat them. And therefore John the Evangelist saith, And the blood of his Son cleanseth us from all sin. Or, whose flesh and blood gives life to those that eat and drink them, but the Son of man's, whom God the Father hath sealed, who is the true and Almighty Son of God; for He, the bread of life, is come down from heaven for us, who gives life unto the world, and whosoever eats thereof shall live for ever: for he himself saith, I am the bread of life that came down from heaven: for this bread of life came down from heaven, which also always stayed in heaven, in the same manner as the Son of man came down from heaven, who, because he is also the Son of God, never left heaven."

We cannot meet with a more orthodox explication of the office of Mediator and Advocate, than that is which he sets down, or a greater precaution than he gives us, not to look upon the saints as mediators, p. 1790 *Mediator igitur ab eo, quod medius sit intra utrasque dissidentium partes, et reconciliet ambos in unum, etc. Denique non Paulus mediator, sed legatus fidelis Mediatoris; Legationera, inquit, fungimur pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo. Advocatus namque est, qui jam pro reconciliatis interpellat, quemadmodum idem Redemptor noster facit, cum humanam Deo Patri, in unitate Dei, hominisque personae, naturam ostendit, Hoc est enim Deum Patrem pro nobis interpellare. Joannes non interpellat, sed ipsum etiam esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris declarat.*

"Wherefore he is called the Mediator, because he is a middle person between both the disagreeing parties, and reconciles them together in one," etc.

"Lastly, Paul is not a mediator, but a faithful ambassador of the Mediator. We are ambassadors for Christ, and the sum of our embassy is, Be ye reconciled to God. An advocate is one that intercedes for those that are already reconciled, even as our Redeemer doth, when he shows his human nature to God the Father, in the unity of his Person, who is God-man; for this is truly to intercede with God the Father for us. John doth not say, that he intercedes for us, but declares him to be a propitiation for our sins."

He clearly shows in the same place, p. 1792. that he did not look upon the saints as redeemers, but Jesus Christ alone, according to the signification of his name; since none of them, who have been redeemed themselves, are able to blot out sin. *Erehim omnipotentis Dei Filius, omnipotent Dominus noster, quia pretio sanguinis sui nos redemit, jure Redemptor, verus omnium redemptorum vocibus predicatur. Non, inquam, ille redemptus, quia nunquam captivus; nos vero redempti, quia fuimus captivi, venundati sub peccato, obligati nimirum in eo chirographo decreti, quod ipse tulit de medio, delens sanguine suo, quod nullius alius redemptorum delete potuit sanguis, addixit illud, palam triumphans in semetipso.*

"For the Son of the Almighty God, our Almighty Lord, because he has redeemed us with the price of his blood, is justly called the true Redeemer, by all that are redeemed by him. He, I say, was not redeemed, because he was never captive; but we are redeemed, who were captives, sold under sin, and bound by the handwriting that was against us, which he took away, blotting it out with his blood, which the blood of no other redeemer could do, and fixed it to his cross, openly triumphing over it in himself."

It plainly appears, that he had no other notion concerning the obscurity of Scripture than we have, by his reproaching Foelix, that he had done according to St. Peter's discourse concerning the writings of St. Paul. p. 1795, and 1796.

He doth not own, that the Church was founded on St. Peter, but on Jesus Christ, p. 1800 and 1801. *Et licet esset primus in ordine Apostolorum, ideo tamen diu siluit, quia non Dominus quid illi, pro quibus solus Petrus responsurus erat, sed quid homines de Filio hominis aestimarent, explorare dignatus est.* "And though he were the first amongst the Apostles, yet he did not speak for some time, because the Lord did not inquire what they, for whom only Peter was to answer, but what men thought of the Son of man."

He lays it down as an inviolable maxim of Christianity, that we cannot believe but in God only, in opposition to that which is taught by the Church of Rome.

He wholly overthrows the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, p. 1808. *ad finire. Ipse quippe solus et singulariter de Spiritu Sancto conceptus, et natus ex Virgine, a vulva sine peccato prodit Deus et homo.* "For he alone being in a singular manner, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin, came forth from the womb without sin, both God and man."

If any one will take the pains to examine the opinions of this Bishop, he will find it an hard thing not to take notice, that he denies what the Church of Rome affirms, with relation to all these articles; and that he affirms what the Church of Rome denies: and whatever colourable arts may be employed, it will be very hard not to perceive this opposition through them all.

I join with St. Paulinus of Aquileia, Paulus Diaconus of the same Church, who, forasmuch as he was very famous towards the end of the eighth, and about the beginning of the ninth century, we have reason not to pass over his opinions without some notice taken of them; and the rather doth his judgment deserve a more particular consideration, because he was born in Lombardy, was Deacon of the Church of Aquileia, whence he was removed by Charles the Great, after his having taken Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards, prisoner, and was honored with the favor of Charles the Great. We have several of his pieces, but I shall content myself with two of his treatises, the one whereof is the Life of St. Gregory the Great, because the Papists believe they have found in that book an invincible proof for transubstantiation; the other is, the collection of homilies he made for all the festival days of the year, by the order of Charles the Great, and which that Emperor authorized by his approbation.

He tells us, in the Life of St. Gregory, that a Roman lady, who was used to make the bread herself which she offered for the Communion, smiling when St. Gregory offered a piece of it to her in the Eucharist, St. Gregory perceiving it, took back the piece of bread, and gave it to the Deacon, to keep it till the Communion was over, at which time he demanded of her why she had laughed to which she answered, that it was because he called that the body of our Lord, which she knew to be a piece of the same bread she had offered. Whereupon St. Gregory made a sermon to the people, exhorting them to beg of God, that he would be pleased to manifest that to them, which that unbelieving woman could not see with the eyes of faith. After prayer, he draws near to the altar, lifts up the corporal pall that covered the piece of bread, and shows them the top of his little finger stained with blood, *ac mulieri dixit, Disce, inquam, veritati vel modo jam credere contestanti, Panis, quem ego do, caro mea est, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Sed prcescius Conditor noster infirmitatis nostree, ea potestate, qua cuncta ex nihilo, et corpus sibi, ex carne semper Virginis, operante Sancto Spiritu fabricavit, panem et vinum aqua mixtum, manente propria specie in carnero et sanguinem suum, ad Catholicam precem, ob reparatioem nostram, Spiritus Sancti sanctificatione convertit:* "and said to the woman, Learn, I say, from henceforward, at least to believe Truth itself, which saith, The bread which I give is my flesh, and my blood is drink indeed. But our Creator foreseeing our weakness, by the same power by which he made the world of nothing, and made himself a body; by the operation of the Holy Ghost, of the flesh of the ever Virgin, has by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit converted the bread and wine mixed with water, still remaining under their own kind, into his flesh and blood, at the catholic prayer, for our salvation."

This done, he commanded all the people to beg of God, ut in formam pristinam sacrosanctum reformaret mysterium, quatenus mulieri ad sumendum fuisset possibile; that he would change that holy mystery into the form it had before, so as the woman might be able to take it; which happening accordingly, strengthened the faith of that lady, and of all the people that were present."

I shall not examine at present, whether this history be a fable or not: sure it is, that most of the particulars it contains seem to be of that character, or at least we find none there, whose truth is attested by witnesses that lived at the time of St. Gregory, or soon after. But let this be as it will, I deny that these miracles, whereof we have some other instances in the book entitled, *Vitae Patrum*, can be of any use to confirm the doctrine of transubstantiation, as Mabillon pretends in the margin of this relation; and that consequently Paulus Diaconus, who relates the same, did not believe transubstantiation.

First, I deny, that by the word species ever any one, speaking of bread, understood any other thing than the substance of bread. Let them prove to us, that the word species did ever heretofore signify the accidents only; this being a notion which transubstantiation gave birth to some ages after that wherein Paulus Diaconus lived.

Secondly, I deny, that from this apparition we can infer the real presence; we may indeed from thence conclude a virtual presence, but nothing more. The consequence is so clear, that it hath been acknowledged by the Schoolmen, whilst they were inquiring, what might be concluded from these kind of apparitions of the flesh of a child, of blood in the Eucharist.

And indeed, if any such thing were to be inferred from these apparitions, we ought also to conclude the contrary; for there have been miracles quite opposite to these now related. I will instance in a very notable one. A Severian heretic having locked up the Eucharist, that his servant, who was a Catholic, had put in his trunk, as Moschus tells us, c. 79. he found ears of corn in the stead of it. Was the substance of bread here returned again, and did it afterwards bring forth ears of corn? Those of the Romish Church are very far from believing any such tiling. We read also in the Life of Melanius Bishop of Rhennes, that the Eucharist was changed into a serpent, to punish the superstition of Marsus, who had preferred the keeping of a fast to the receiving of the Communion, and that afterwards the said serpent was changed into the Eucharist again at the prayer of Melanius, and was then received by Marsus.

Besides, Paulus Diaconus himself shows us in his following relation, what he would have us to conclude from this sort of miracles. He tells us, that a great lord having sent his ambassadors to Rome, to obtain some relics of the Apostles and Martyrs, that St. Gregory, instead of the relics they desired, gave them only some pieces of consecrated cloth, which he severally put up into boxes, and delivered them unto the ambassadors, having first sealed the boxes with his own seal. And adds, that the ambassadors being seized with a curiosity, on their journey homeward, to know what those boxes contained, they had been strangely surprised, upon opening of them, to find nothing there but some scraps of cloth, which made them return back to Rome, to make their complaint, that, instead of the bones of Martyrs or Apostles, they had given them nothing but some bits of cloth. Upon these complaints made by the ambassadors to the Archdeacon, St. Gregory commandeth them to come to church, and exhorted the people to pray to God; *Quatenus in hac re dignetur apertissime sic suam potentiam patefacere, ut quid mereatur fides, evidentius minus erudull et ignorantes possint cognoscere, let data oratione accepit cultellum qui temeraverat signa, et super altare corporis sancti Petri, acceptam unam panni portionera per medium pungens secuit, ex qua statim sanguis decurrit, et omnem candem portiunculam cruentavit. Videntes autem suprascripti legatarii, et omnes populi, stupendum et arcanum fidei sacrx miraculum, ceciderunt proni in terrain, adorantes Dominum, dicentes, Mirabills Deus in sanctis suis, Deus Israel, ipse dabit virtutem et cetera multitudinem plebisure, benedictus Deus. Et facto silentio, inter alia fidei documenta, dixit ad eos beatus Gregorius, quiaante has venerandas relictuias parvi duxerant, Scitote, fratres, quia in consecratione corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu, cum ob sanctificationem reliquiarum in honore Apostolorum vel Martyrum ipsius quibus specialiter assignabantur; supra sacrosanctum altare libamina offerebantur, semper illorum sanguis hos pannos intravit qui effusus est pro nobiscum Christi Domini nostri.*

"That he would be pleased so openly to declare his power on this occasion, that the unbelievers and the ignorant might know what faith is able to effect. And prayer being ended, he took the knife wherewith the seals had been broke open, and laying one of those pieces of cloth upon the holy altar of St. Peter, he struck the knife through it, from whence immediately blood gushed forth, which stained the whole piece of cloth: whereupon the ambassadors and all the people beholding this astonishing and mysterious miracle of holy faith, fell flat down with their faces to the ground, and worshipped the Lord, saying, Wonderful is the Lord in his saints, the God of Israel, he shall give virtue and strength to his people, blessed be God. And after silence was made, amongst other instructions in the faith, St. Gregory said unto them, who before had undervalued these venerable relics, Know ye, brethren, that in consecrating the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, when for the sanctification of relics in honor of the Apostles or Martyrs, whose they were, drink offerings were offered on the holy altar, their blood, which was shed for the name of Jesus Christ, always entered these pieces of cloth."

This is that they call Brandcure, mentioned by Sigebert, upon the year 441, when he says, that St. Leo had brought it into request. True it is, that this fable is of a sort unknown to all antiquity; but, however, it proves thus much, that these apparitions of blood in the Host suppose no more than the virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ.

As to the homilies of the primitive Fathers, whereof Paulus Diaconus made a collection, it is very surprising to find not so much as one inserted amongst them, whence we can pick this doctrine of the real

presence, if he with the Church of his time had conceived this to have been the doctrine of the primitive Church. We find indeed in this his collection some homilies of St. Leo, Feriae 2, 3, 4. and some others, which treat of the sacrament of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ substituted instead of the Passover: but we find this matter so drily handled in them, that it is hard to conceive how these expressions of antiquity could satisfy a man who had been tinged with the doctrine of Paschasius.

As for those other Romish doctrines, which at this day are made the leading points of religion, we may boldly say, that we can find nothing of them in this collection of homilies, amongst which there are many of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, and Maximus, Bishop of Turin, whose belief we have already given a sufficient account of: the rest of this collection consists for the most part of the homilies of Origen, St. Jerome, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and venerable Bede, whose opinions are well known; there being scarce any of these authors, whose belief has not been represented in particular, to make it appear how far they were from concurring with the opinions of the Church of Rome about the principal doctrines, which at this day are the causes of the separation of the Protestants from that Church.

CHAPTER 9

Opinions of the Church of Italy during the ninth century

We are now come to the ninth century, wherein after this diocese had been subject to several princes it came into the hands of Charles the Great and his successors. We have already seen how the Prelates of this diocese, at the Council of Francfort, opposed themselves to superstition, which then began to gather strength. But we shall perceive this more clearly in the sequel of this discourse. It cannot be denied, but that the state of the Church in general was, as it were, wholly overthrown. Angilbertus, Bishop of Milan, gives us a most sad representation of it, in the relation which he gives to Ludovicus Pius.

"To our great sorrow," saith he, "we have found, that scarce ought of holiness or sincerity is left in the Church, and the corruptions are crept into it;" which afterwards he instanceth in particular: and I doubt not but Italy had her share of the infection. Indeed superstition could not but increase under the shelter of so profound a negligence of the pastors, as did then obtain: but the Divine providence was pleased to provide a remedy against it by means of **CLAUDIUS, BISHOP OF TURIN**. And since Claudius had a great share in defending of the truth in this diocese of Italy, where God had placed him, and that by this means he has been extremely exposed to the calumnies of the Romish party; it will be very well worth our pains, to represent here these three things, his character, his writings, and his opinions.

This Claudius was born in Spain; he had been a disciple of Foelix, Bishop of Urgel; he was for some years in the court of Ludovicus Pius amongst his Chaplains; and being endowed with great talents for a preacher, when Lewis was advanced to the empire, he caused him to be ordained Bishop of Turin. It will probably be imagined, that he had borrowed from Foelix, Bishop of Urgel, the companion of Elipandus, the opinions of Nestorianism: but whosoever thinks so, will find himself mistaken; for his character of a great preacher, which had procured him the esteem of the Emperor, and his long continuance in Lewis's court, during the life of Charles the Great, a court where that opinion, since the condemnation of Foelix and Elipandus, at Francfort, in 794, was very much had in detestation, are sufficient to purge him from any such suspicion. But over and above all this, his writings upon the Scripture show him to have been very far from that opinion; for we find in several passages unquestionable evidences of his orthodox judgment in this point. What he saith upon the 25th of St. Matthew, verse 31. is decisive in this matter; and yet he expresseth himself more strongly, if it be possible, on Matthew 22. verse 2. Neither is it less easy to purge him of another calumny, which was east upon him after his death, by Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, who, in his preface to king Charles the Bald, accuseth him for having endeavored to revive the sect of Arius. I thought at first, that this was only a fault of the transcriber, who had writ Arius for Aerijs; but the manner of Jonas's expressing himself has made me retract my first conjecture: however, it is no less easy to refute this calumny, than it was to clear him from the first suspicion. In a word, we do not find any thing like it in so many books writ by him, and we find that which is contrary to it on Matthew 12. verse 25. Let them make out to us, that any such thing was found amongst his papers after his death, as Jonas seems to insinuate, and we shall believe that Jonas was not over apt to give credit to those men, whose only aim was to bespatter the reputation of Claudius, and to make it odious and detestable to posterity, because he cried down their superstition and idolatry. Except they perform this, we must still look upon this accusation as a mere calumny.

As for the works of this great man, we may affirm, there were few in his time who took so much pains to explain the Scripture, or to oppose themselves against the torrent of superstition.

He wrote three books upon Genesis in the year 815. He made a commentary on St. Matthew, which he published the same year, dedicating it to Justus, Abbot of Charroux.

He published a commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians in the year 816, and dedicated it to Dructeramnus, a famous abbot, who had exhorted him to write comments upon all St. Paul's Epistles.

He wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, which he dedicated to Ludovicus Plus, who commanded him to comment upon St. Paul's Epistles; which dedicatory epistle of his has been published by Mabillon.

He made a commentary upon Exodus, in four books, which he published in the year 821, dedicating them to the Abbot Theodemirus.

He made also another on Leviticus, which he published in the year 823, and dedicated it to the same Abbot. Oudin tells us, he hath seen a commentary of his on the Book of Ruth, in a library in Hainault.

Of all these his works, there is nothing printed but his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians. The monks of St. Germain have his commentary upon all the Epistles in MS. in two volumes, which were found in the library of the abbey of Fleury, near Orleans. They have also his MS. commentaries on Leviticus, which formerly belonged to the library of St. Remy at Rheims. As for his commentary on St. Matthew, there are several MS. copies of it in England, as well as elsewhere.

We may judge in what credit and esteem the doctrine of Claudius was at that time, by the earnestness wherewith the Emperor Ludovicus Plus, and the most famous Abbots of those times, pressed him to explain the holy Scripture in his writings. We may also conclude the same, from his being promoted to the episcopal dignity in a place where the superstition in reference to images obliged the Emperor to provide them with a Bishop that was both learned and vigorous; for Jonas of Orleans cannot dissemble, but that it was upon this very consideration, that the Emperor made a particular choice of Claudius to be consecrated Bishop of Turin.

Moreover, this see was not an ordinary bishopric, but a very considerable metropolis in the diocese of Italy; but it was not till some time after, that the title of Archbishops was bestowed upon Metropolitans.

The time wherein he was advanced to the episcopal dignity is not certainly known. Father Le Cointe conjectures, very probably, that it was in the year 817. But whether that be so or no, sure it is, that Claudius, in his illustration of the Scripture, plainly showed himself to be very free from those errors which at this day are in vogue in Romish communion.

We need only read his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians, to assure us, that he every where asserts the equality of all the Apostles with St. Peter, though the occasions seemed naturally to engage him to establish the primacy of St. Peter, and that of his pretended successors. This we find in ten several passages of that commentary; he only declares the primacy of St. Peter to consist in the honor he had of founding the Church both amongst the Jews and Gentiles, p. 810. And indeed every where throughout his writings he maintains, that Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church.

He overthrows the doctrine of merits in such a manner as overthrows all the nice distinctions of the Papists on that subject.

He pronounces anathemas against traditions in matter of religion: so far was he from giving occasion to others to suspect, that he made them a part of the object of his faith, as the Church of Rome at present doth.

He maintains, that faith alone saves us, which is the point that so extremely provoked the Church of Rome against Luther, who asserted the same thing.

He holds the Church to be subject to error, opposite to what at this day the Romanists pretend in so unreasonable a manner.

He denies, that prayers after death may be of any use to those that have demanded them.

He very smartly lashed the superstition and idolatry, which then began to be renewed, being supported by the authority of the Roman see. These things we find in his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians; but the other writings of this great man, manuscript and printed, show us yet more of his mind. Indeed, we find him giving very public marks of his zeal for the purity of religion in several points. First, he proposeth the doctrine of the Church, in reference to the Eucharist, in a manner altogether conformable to the judgment of antiquity, following therein the most illustrious doctors of the Christian Church, and showing that he was, as to that matter, at the farthest distance from the opinions which Paschasius Radbertus advanced eighteen or nineteen years after that Claudius had writ his commentary upon St. Matthew. Claudius's own words, as they were taken from a MS. of M. Theyet, are these:

Coenantibus autem eis, accepit Jesus panem, et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis, et ait, Accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum. Finitis paschac veteris solenniis, qua in commemorationem antiqua de Aegypto libemtionis populi Dei agebantur, translit ad novum, quod in sure redemptionis memoriam Ecclesiam frequentare volebat : ut videlicet et pro came agni ac sanguine sui corporis sanguinisque sacramentum substitueret, ipsumque se esse monstraret, cui juravit Dominus, et non poenitebit eum, Tu es sacerdos in actemum secundum ordinem Melchisedec. Frangit autem ipse panem quem discipulis porrigit, ut ostendat corporis sui fractionem non absque sua sponte ac procuracione venturam; sed sicut alibi dicit, potestatem se habere ponendi animam suam, et potestatem se habere irerum sumendi eam. Quem videlicet panem certi quoque gratia sacramenti, priusquam frangeret benedixit. Quia naturam humanam quam passurus assumpsit, ipse una cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto gratia divince virtutis implevit. Benedixit panem, et fregit, quia hominem assumptum ita morti subdere dignatus est, ut et divince immortalitatis vemiciter inesse potent Jam demonstraret, Ideoque velocius eum a morte resuscitandum esse doceret. Et accipiens calicem, gratias egit, et dedit illis, dicens, Bibire ex hoc omnes. Cum appropinquare passioni dicitur, accepto pane et calice, gratiam egisse perhibetur; gratias itaque egit qui flagella alienoe iniquitatis suscepit. Et qui nihil dighum percussioni exhibuit, humiliter in percussione benedixit. Ut hinc videlicet ostendat, fuid unusquisque in fagello culpae propriac facere debeat: si ipse acquamitter flagella culpae portat alienoe; ut hinc ostendat, quid in correptione faciat subditus, si in dgaello positus Patti gratias agit aqualis. Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem opemur in came; hic ad corpus Christi mystice, illud refertur ad sanguinem. Verum quia et nos in Christo, et in nobis Christum manere oportet, vinum Dominici calicis aqua miscetur. Attestante enim Johanne, aquae populi sunt. Et neque aquam solam, neque solum vinum, sicut nec granum frumenti solum sine admixtione aquae et confectione, in panem cuiquam licet offerre, ne videlicet oblatio talis quasi caput a membro secemendum esse significet, et vel Christum sine nostrac redemptionis amore pati potuisse, vel nos sine illius passione salvari ac Patri offerri posse confingat. Quod autem dicit, Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, ad distinctionem respicit veteris testamenti, quod hircorum et vitulorum est sanguine dedicatum; dicente inter aspergendum legislatore, Hic est sanguis testamenti, quod mandavit ad vos Deus. Necesse est enim exemplaria quidem verorum his mundari; ipsa autem coelestia melioribus hostiis quam istis, juxta quod Apostolus per totam ad Hebracos Epistolam, inter Legem distinguens et Evangelium, pulcherrima ezpositione ac plenaria ratione declarat. Dicto autem vobis, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Vitem sive vineam Domini appellatam esse synagogam, et omnis sparsim Scriptura et apertius testatur Isaias in cantico de illo cantato, Vineam, inquiens, Domini Sabaoth, domus Isracl est. De qua nimirum vinea Dominus multo tempore bibebat, quamvis pluribus ramis in amaritudinem vitis alienae conversis, quod tamen etsi multis in illa plebe exorbitantibus a recto fidei itinere, non defuere plurimi toto Legis tempore, quorum piis cogitationibus summisque virtutibus delectaretur Deus. Verum passo in came Domino, ac resurgente a mortuis, tempus fuit ut legalis illa et figuralis observatio cessaret, atque ea quae secundum litem gerebantur, in spiritalem translata sensum, melius in novum testamentum, juvante Sancti Spiritus gratia, tenerentur. Iturus igitur ad passionem Dominus ait, Jam non bibam de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Ac si aperte dicat, Non ultra camalibus synagogae ceremoniis delectabor, in quibus etiam ista paschalis agni sacra locum tenuere praccipuum: aderit enim tempus meae resurrectionis: aderit dies ille cum ipse in regno Dei positus, id est, gloria vitae immortalis sublimatus, de salute populi ejusdem fonte gratiae spiritalis regenemti, novo vobiscum gaudio perfundat Item quod ait, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei, vult intelligi hoc vetus esse, cum illud novum dicit; quia ergo de propagine Adam, quivetus homo appellatur, corpus suscepit, quod in passione morti traditurus emt: unde etiam per vini sacramentum commendat sanguinem suum, quid aliud novum vinum nisi immortalitatem renovatorum corporum intelligere debemus? Quod cum dicit, Vobiscum bibam, etiam

ipsis resurrectionem corporum ad induendam immortalitatem promittit. Vobiscum enim non ad idem tempus, sed ad eandem innovationem dictum, accipiendum est. Nam et nos dicit Apostolus resurrexisse cum Christo, ut spe rei futurac jam lactitiam pracsentem affemt: quod autem de hoc genimine vitis etiam illud novum esse dicit, significat utique eadem corpora resurrectura secundum innovationem coelestem, quae nunc secundum vetustatem moritura sunt. Si hanc vitem de cujus vetustate nunc passionis calicem bibit, ipsos Judacos intellexeris, significatum est etiam ipsam gentem ad corpus Christi per nvitatem vitae accessuram; cum ingressa plentitudine gentium, omnis IsracI salvus fiet. Et hymno dicto exierunt in montem Oliveti; hoc est quod in Psalmo legimus, Edent pauperes, et saturabuntur; et laudabunt Dominum qui requirunt eum: Potest autem et hymnus etiam ille intelligi quem Dominus secundum Johannem Patri gratias agens decantabat, in quo et pro seipso, et pro discipulis, et pro eis qui per verbum eorum credituri erant, elevatis oculis sursum precabatur. Et pulchre discipulos sacramentis sui coporis ac sanguinis imbutos, et hymno piac intercessionis Patri commendatos, in montem educit Olivarum, ut typice designet nos per acceptionem sacramentorum suorum, perque open suac intercessionis, ad altoria virtutum, ut carismate Sancti Spiritus in corde pergungamur, conscendere debere.

"The Apostles being sat down at table, Jesus Christ took bread, blessed and brake it, and gave of it to his disciples, saying to them, Take this and eat it, this is my body. The ancient ceremonies of the ancient Passover, which were used in memory of the deliverance of the people of Israel, being finished, he passeth on to the new, because he would have the same to be celebrated in his Church in commemoration of the mystery of her redemption, and to substitute the Sacrament of his body and of his blood, instead of the flesh and blood of the paschal lamb, and to show that it was he himself to whom God had sworn, and shall never repent of it; Thou art the eternal Priest according to the order of Melchizedeck. Moreover, he himself breaks the bread which he gives to his disciples, that he might represent and make it appear, that the breaking of his body would not be contrary to his inclination, or without his willingness to die: but, as he saith elsewhere that he had power to give his life, and to deliver it up himself, as well as to take it again, and raise himself from the dead. He blessed the bread before he broke it, to assure us, that he intended to make a Sacrament of it; and forasmuch as he had taken human nature upon him, that he might suffer, he with his Father and the Holy Spirit filled the same with the grace of a virtue which was altogether divine; and because he was pleased to submit the human nature he had taken upon him, to death, he would make it appear, that the said humanity was possessed of a true and natural power to raise itself: whereby he taught us, that the same would rise more readily from the dead. And taking the cup, he gave thanks to his Father, and gave it them to drink, saying, Drink ye all of it. When he drew near to the time of his death and passion, it is said, that having taken the bread and the cup, he gave thanks to his eternal Father. He therefore who had taken upon him to expiate the iniquities of others, gave thanks to his Father, without having done any thing that was worthy of death: he blesseth it with a profound humility, at the very time that he saw himself loaden with stripes; without doubt to instruct us, what every one of us ought to do when we find ourselves lashed with the whip and sting of our conscience: for, if he who was innocent endured with meekness and tranquillity the stripes due to the iniquity of others; this was to teach and instruct us what he ought to do that is obnoxious, when he is corrected for his own transgressions. If he suffered with an equal mind the scourge due for the sins of others, this teaches us what a subject ought to do when under the Divine corrections; when he who is equal to the Father gave thanks to him when under his scourges: For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for you all, for the remission of sin; because he assures us, that the bread becomes his body, and that the wine doth operate and produce his blood in the flesh. The bread represents to us his mystical body, and the wine is the symbol of his blood. But, because we must abide in Christ, and Christ must abide in us, we mingle water with the wine in the cup of the Lord. And, as St. John witnesseth, the people are water, and it is not permitted to any body to offer water alone, no more than the wine alone; in like manner as it is forbidden to offer the grains of wheat, without their being mingled with water, and so reduced to bread, for fear lest such an oblation might signify, that the Head ought to be separated from its members, and that Jesus Christ could have suffered, without an extreme love and desire of our redemption; or that this oblation did not give us ground to believe, that we might be saved, or offered up to his Father without the mystery of his passion. As for his saying, This is my blood of the new testament, it is that we might make a distinction between the new covenant and the old, which was consecrated with the effusion of the blood of goats and oxen, as the Lawgiver said at the sprinkling of it; This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you: for it is necessary that the patterns of true things should be purified by these; but that the heavenly places should be purified with more excellent sacrifices, according to what the Apostle St. Paul declares throughout his whole Epistle to the Hebrews, where he makes a distinction between the Law and the Gospel. He declares, by an excellent and ample explication, Verily, verily, this I say unto you, I will drink

no more of the vine, till I shall drink it new in the kingdom of my Father. The whole Scripture openly declares, that the synagogue is called the Vine of the Lord; the Prophet Isaiah openly sets this forth in his song, where he speaks of it in these words; The house of Israel is the Lord's Vine. It is indeed of this vine that the Lord drank large draughts, though many branches thereof were infected with the bitterness of a strange Vine; and though in the mean time many of the people are gone astray from the true way of the faith, yet there were still found a great many, during the whole time of the Law, who glorified God by their holy and godly thoughts, and by the practice of their heroic virtues. But Jesus Christ having suffered in the flesh that was capable of suffering, and being raised from the dead, the time is come that hath put an end to these legal and figurative observations: all those things that were observed according to the letter, have been changed into a spiritual sense, and have been confirmed in the new testament by the grace of the Holy Ghost. Jesus Christ then going to suffer, saith, I shall drink no more of this juice of the vine, until the day that I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father. As if he had plainly said, I will no longer take delight in the carnal ceremonies of the synagogue amongst the number of which the great festival of the paschal lamb was one of the chiefs for this shall be the time of my resurrection; that very day I shall be lifted up to the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, to the kingdom of a new life of immortality; I shall be filled together with you with a new joy for the salvation of my people, which shall be born again in the spring of one and the same grace. In like manner also when he saith, I shall not drink of this juice of the vine, until the day that I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father, he would be understood of the old testament, when he calls it the new: and therefore since he had taken a body from the family of Adam, who is called the old man, and that this his body was now to be exposed to death; it is for this reason that by the sacrament of wine he recommends to us his blood. What are we to understand by this new wine but the immortality of our renewed bodies? For when he saith, I will drink it with you, he promiseth to them also the resurrection of their bodies, in order to their being clothed with immortality. For this word *vobiscum* (with you) must not be taken as spoken of the same time, but as importing that the disciples should in time to come be renewed, as well as he. For doth not the Apostle say, that we are all raised again with Christ, that our future resurrection might afford us present joy? And whereas he saith, of this juice of the vine, and calls it also new, this for certain signifies, that the same bodies must be raised again, according to the rules of an altogether heavenly renovation, though at present they must die, according to the old man. If you understand the Jews by this vine, from the oldness of which he at present now drinks the cup of his passion; it hath also been signified to us, that that nation must approach to the body of Jesus Christ by the change of a new life: The whole house of Israel shall be saved, together with all its company, which shall enter with them. After they had sung a hymn, they went to the mount of Olives. This is that which we read in the Psalmist, The poor shall eat and be filled; and they that seek the Lord shall praise him. This hymn may be also understood, according to the account St. John gives of it, to be that which Jesus Christ sang, when he gave thanks to his eternal Father, wherein he prayed for himself, for his disciples, and for all those who should believe at their preaching. And it is not without cause that he leads his disciples to the mount of Olives, after having fed them with the sacraments of his body and his blood, and after his having recommended them to his Father by the hymn of a tender intercession to inform us, without doubt, that it is by receiving of the sacraments, and by the assistance of his prayer, that we must come to the possession of heroic virtues, and that it is by this means alone, that we shall receive in our hearts the unctions of the Holy Spirit."

We find by this extract, that he followed the notions of the primitive Church closely on this subject, and that the Church which bordered upon the mountains of the Alps did not entertain any opinions like those of Paschasius. We ought to observe here, as a thing natural and obvious, that if he endured some contradiction upon other articles, yet he never was impleaded about that of the Eucharist; which shows that that truth, at that time, was yet in possession of its own rights, and that those who quarreled with him about other articles, as Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, Dungalus, and the Abbot Theodemirus, were of his opinion about the matter of the Eucharist. For seeing his commentary upon St. Matthew was published in the year 815, and that Theodemirus continued still his friend in 823, pressing him to write on the Old Testament, it is evident, that till then nothing had interrupted the good correspondence that was between them.

Mabillon has published an extract from the end of his work upon Leviticus, dedicated to Abbot Theodemirus, which shows the great care that he took to withdraw those of his diocese from the hankering they had after the worship of creatures, and the troubles and crosses he had met with from those who were willing to defend their superstitions. "Because you have commanded me to write these things, I have undertaken it, not as for your instruction, but for your satisfaction. But it is your duty to judge of it with

more truth, and to stir up yourself by your examples, to the practice of a true charity, which is the most excellent of all virtues. And I assure myself, that I may more easily attain to the possession of that virtue by means of your prayers than by any strength of my own. See here, my dear brother, what I have here answered, as well as I could, to certain demands you have made of me. And I earnestly desire you on this occasion, that if you have discovered, or can find for time to come, any thing better, concerning the things about which you command me to write unto you, we shall take it very kindly, if you shall be pleased to communicate the same to us; for I am naturally more inclined to learn, than to teach others. For this beauty of the eternal Truth and Wisdom God grant I may always have a constant will to enjoy her, for the love of whom we have also undertaken this work doth not exclude those that come unto her, because of the great number of hearers she hath; she grows not old by length of time; she minds not places; she does not suffer herself to be overtaken by night; she does not shut up herself in shadows, and doth not expose herself to our bodily senses: she is near unto all those that turn themselves to her froth all parts of the world, and who love her indeed; she is eternal to all; she is not limited by any places, she is every where; she adviseth abroad, she instructs within, she changes and converts those that behold her; she doth not suffer herself to be violated by any person; no man can judge of her, nobody can judge well without her. In this idea of my faith, I separate all change and alteration from eternity; and in this eternity I discover no space of time, for the spaces of time are made up of future and past motions of things: now there is nothing past or future in eternity; for that which passeth ceaseth to be, and that which is to come has not yet begun to be: but as for eternity, it is that which is always present, nor ever has been, so as not to be present still; nor ever shall be, but so as still to continue present; because it is she alone that can say to the spirit of man, It is I who am the Lord; and it is of her alone we can say with truth, he who is eternal has sent me.

"And since this is the case, we are not commanded to go to the creature, that we may be happy, but to the Creator, who alone can constitute our bliss; of whom if we entertain other opinions than we ought to have, we involve ourselves in a very pernicious error. For as long as we shall endeavor to come to that which is not, or which, supposing it to be, yet doth not make us happy, we shall never be able to arrive at a happy life. A man doth not become happy because another is so; but when a man imitates another, that he may become such as he is, he desires immediately to become happy by the same means he finds another is become so, that is, by the enjoyment of this universal and unchangeable Truth. Neither can a man become prudent by the prudence of another, or valiant by the valor, or temperate by the temperance, or just by the justice of another; but by forming and fashioning his mind by the immutable rules and splendors of those virtues, which without alteration shine forth in this common universal truth and wisdom: in imitation of whom he formed and squared his manners whom we propose to ourselves as a pattern to imitate, and whom we look upon as a living copy of that eternal Wisdom. Our will fastening itself, and cleaving to this unchangeable and common good, affords the first, and great good things man is capable of, because she is a certain mean good. But when the will of man separates itself from this unchangeable and common good, and seeks her own particular good, or directs herself to any outward or inferior good, she sins."

After this he quotes an excellent passage of St. Austin, from his treatise concerning the *True Religion*.

"Wherefore we owe no religious worship to those who are departed this life, because thee have lived religiously; we must not look upon them as persons that require our adorations and homage, but they desire that he may be worthy of our respect, by whom they being enlightened rejoice to see us made partakers of their piety. We must therefore honor them, because they deserve to be imitated; but we must not worship them with an act of religion. And if they have lived wickedly, we do not owe them any respect at all, in what part soever of the world they be. That then which is honored by the highest angel must also be honored by the lowest of men, because the nature of man is become the lowest, for not having honored him. For an angel takes not his wisdom elsewhere than man does. The truth of an angel and that of man are both derived from the same fountain, that is, from one and the same eternal Truth and Wisdom. For by a pure effect of that eternal Wisdom it comes to pass, that the power of God, and that unchangeable Wisdom consubstantial and coeternal with the Father, hath vouchsafed, in order to the accomplishment of the adorable mystery of our salvation, to take our human nature upon him, that he might teach us, that we owe our adorations to him who alone deserves to be worshipped by all intelligent and rational creatures. We ought also to believe, that those good angels, which are the most excellent ministers of God, would have us to worship one only God together with them, by the alone vision of whom they are happy. For we

are not happy in beholding the angels, neither can that vision ever make us so; but we shall be happy by beholding the Truth, by means of which we love the angels, and congratulate them. Neither do we envy their happiness, because they are more active than we, and because they enjoy the vision of God, without being molested with any trouble; but rather love them so much the more, because our hope puts us upon expecting something answerable to these their excellencies, from him who is the God of us both. Wherefore we honor them with our charitable respects, but not like slaves: we build no temples to them, neither will they be honored by us in any such manner, because they know that we, whilst we are good, are the temples of the living God."

After his quoting of this passage, see how he concludes his work.

"These things are the highest and strongest mysteries of our faith, and characters most deeply imprinted in our hearts. In standing up for the confirmation and defense of which truth, I am become a reproach to my neighbors to that degree, that those who see us do not only scoff at us, but point at us, one to another: but God, the father of mercies and author of all consolations, has comforted us in all our afflictions, that we might be able, in like manner, to comfort those that are pressed with sorrow and affliction: we rely upon the protection of Him who has armed and fortified us with the armor of righteousness and of faith, which is the tried shield for our eternal salvation."

He seems in these words to allude to the complaints that had been made against him, at Ludovicus Pius's court, for having broke down images throughout his diocese, and for writing, in defense of himself, a treatise against the adoration of images, the worship of saints, pilgrimages, the worship of relics, with other such like superstitions. And since the cruel diligence of the Inquisitors has destroyed this piece, we must guess at the time wherein he wrote it, from the account his adversaries give us thereof, viz. Theodemirus, Dungalus, and Jonas of Orleans, and search in their books for his true opinions, and the arguments he made use of against the defenders of superstition.

Dungalus wrote in the year 828, as appears clearly from what he mentions of the decree passed in Ludovicus Pius's palace, after the assembly of Paris in the year 825, about the matter of images, as a tiling which happened two years before. In his book he accuseth Claudius for taking upon him, after eight hundred and twenty years and more, to reprove those things that were passed in continual use, as if there had been none before him that ever had any zeal for religion; from whence it is evident, that Claudius wrote since the year 820. It seems indeed as if he had answered the Abbot Theodemirus after the year 823, who had intimated to him the offense that was taken at his behavior and opinions, which he did so effectually as not to have any need to write another treatise upon the same subject.

However it is Dungalus himself who has preserved the extracts of the apologetical answer, which Claudius made about that time, to the Abbot Theodemirus; which apologetic he begins in this manner:

"I have received," saith he to Theodemirus, "by a particular bearer thy letter, with the articles, wholly stuffed with babbling and fooleries. You declare in these articles, that you have been troubled that my fame was spread, not only throughout all Italy, but also in Spain, and elsewhere; as if I had formerly, and still do preach a new sect, contrary to the rules of the ancient Catholic faith, which is most absolutely false: neither is it any wonder at all, if the members of Satan talk of me at this rate, who have also called our Head a deceiver, one that hath a devil, etc. For I teach no new sect, as keeping myself to the pure truth, preaching and publishing nothing but that; but on the contrary, as far as in me lies, I have repressed, opposed, cast down, and destroyed, and do still repress, oppose, and destroy, to the utmost of my power, all sects, schisms, superstitions, and heresies, and shall never cease so to do, by the assistance of God, as far as I am able: for since it is expressly said, Thou shalt not make to thyself the resemblance of any thing, either in heaven or on earth, etc., this is not alone to be understood of the images and resemblances of strange gods, but also of those of celestial creatures.

"These kind of people, against whom we have undertaken to defend the Church of God, tell us, If thou write upon the wall, or drawest the images of Peter or of Paul, of Jupiter, Saturn, or of Mercury; neither are the one of these gods, nor the other apostles, and neither the one nor the other of them are men, and therefore the name is changed: and in the mean time, both then and now, the same ever continues still. Surely, if we ought to worship them, we ought rather to worship them alive, than as thou hast represented them as the portraitures of beasts, or (what is yet more true) of stone or wood, which have neither life, nor feeling, nor reason: for if we may neither worship nor serve the works of God's hand, how much less may we worship the works of men's hands, and adore them in honor of those whose resemblances we say they are? for if the image you worship is not God, (for not only he who serves and honors visible images, but also whatsoever creature else, whether heavenly or earthly, whether spiritual or corporal, he serves the same instead of God, and from it he looks for the salvation of his soul, which he ought to look for from God alone, and is of the number of those, of whom the Apostle saith, that they worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator,) wherefore dost thou bow to false images, and wherefore like a slave dost thou bend thy body to pitiful shrines, and to the work of men's hands?

"But mark what the followers of the false religion and superstition do allege: they say, it is in commemoration and in honor of our Savior, that we serve, honor, and adore the cross, whom nothing pleaseth in our Savior, but that which was pleasing to the ungodly, viz. the reproach of his passion, and the token of his death. They witness hereby, that they perceive only of him what the wicked saw and perceived of him, whether Jews or Heathens, who do not see his resurrection, and do not consider him, but as altogether swallowed up of death, without minding what the Apostle saith, We know Jesus Christ no longer according to the flesh. "God commands one thing, and these people do quite the contrary; God commands us to bear our cross, and not to worship it; but these are all for worshipping it; whereas they do not bear it at all, neither will they bear it either corporally or spiritually: to serve God after this manner is to go a whoring from him. For if we ought to adore the cross, because Christ was fastened to it, how many other things are there which touched Jesus Christ, and which he made according to the flesh? Did not he continue nine months in the womb of the Virgin? Why do not they then on the same score worship all that are virgins, because a virgin brought forth Jesus Christ? Why do not they adore mangers and old clouts, because he was laid in a manger, and wrapped in swaddling clothes? Why do not they adore fisher-boats, because he slept in one of them, and preached to the multitudes, and caused a net to be cast out, wherewith was caught a miraculous quantity of fish? Let them adore asses, because he entered into Jerusalem upon the foal of an ass; and lambs, because it is written of him, Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world. But these sort of men would rather eat live lambs than worship their images. Why do not they worship lions, because he is called the Lion of the tribe of Judah? Or rocks, because it is said, And the Rock was Christ? or thorns, because he was crowned with them? or lances, because one of them pierced his side?

"All these things are ridiculous, rather to be lamented, than set forth in writing: but we are forced to set them down, in opposition to fools, and to declaim against those hearts of stone, whom the arrows and sentences of the word of God cannot pierce; and therefore we are fain to fling such stones at them. Come to yourselves again, ye miserable transgressors; why are you gone astray from truth, and why, being become vain, are ye fallen in love with vanity. Why do you crucify again the Son of God, and expose him to open shame; and by this means make souls by troops to become the companions of devils, estranging them from their Creator by the horrible sacrilege of your images and likenesses, and precipitating them into everlasting damnation?

"And as for your reproaching me, that I hinder men from running in pilgrimage to Rome; I will first demand of you yourself, whether thou knowest, that to go to Rome is to repent or do penance? If it be so indeed, why then hast thou for so long a time damned so many souls, whom thou hast kept up in thy monastery, and whom thou hast taken into it, that they might there do penance, obliging them to serve thee, instead of sending them

to Rome, if it be so that the way to do penance be to go to Rome, and yet thou hast hindered them? What have you to say against this sentence, That. whosoever shall lay a stone of stumbling before any of these little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hung about his neck, and he east into the bottom of the sea?

"We know very well, that this passage of the Gospel is very ill understood; Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: under the pretense of which words the stupid and ignorant common people, destitute of all spiritual knowledge betake themselves to Rome, in hopes of acquiring eternal life: for the ministry does belong to all the true superintendants and pastors of the Church, who discharge the same, as long as they are in this world; and when they have paid the debt of death, others succeed in their places, who enjoy the same authority and power. "Return O ye blind, to your light; return to him who enlightens every man that cometh into the world: all of you, as many as you be, who do not keep only to this light, you walk in darkness, and know not whither you go; for the darkness has put out your eyes. If we must believe God when he promiseth how much more when he swears, and saith, that if Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, (that is, if the saints whom you call upon were endowed with as great holiness, as great righteousness, and as much merit, as these were,) they shall neither deliver son nor daughter: and it is for this end he makes this declaration, viz. that none might put their confidence either in the merits or the intercession of saints. Understand ye this, ye people without understanding? Ye fools, when will ye be wise? ye who run to Rome, to seek there for the intercession of an Apostle. What think you would St. Augustin say of you, whom we have already so often quoted," etc.

"The fifth thing you reproach me for is, that it displeaseth thee that the Apostolic Lord (for so you are pleased to call the late Pope Pasehal deceased) had honored me with this charge; but forasmuch as the word Apostolicus dicitur quasi Apostoli custos, may intimate as much as the Apostle's keeper, know thou, that he only is apostolic, who is the keeper and guardian of the Apostle's doctrine, and not he who boasts himself to be seated in the chair of the Apostle, and in the mean time doth not acquit himself of the charge of the Apostle; for the Lord saith, that the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's chair."

Now, because Jonas of Orleans had no other extracts out of the book of Claudius, besides those that had been already refuted by Dungalus, a recluse of the abbey of St. Denys, therefore he confines himself to refute the same opinions of Claudius, which he did only in the year 840, about a year after Claudius's death; whereupon I desire the reader to consider, First, that notwithstanding Dungalus and Jonas did both write by the order of kings, and that they make mention of a condemnation of Claudius passed in the palace, yet nothing of all this was able to shake the reputation of Claudius. He wrote against all these superstitions from the year 823, and did not die till the year 839; so that for sixteen years together he was only set upon by some particular persons, by an obscure and recluse Monk, who was a stranger to France, and who probably being an Italian took part with the Church of Rome, at that time engaged for the worshippers of idols.

Secondly, That the Fathers of the Assembly of Paris, in the year 825, had justified most of the principles maintained by Claudius, this great man having been only engaged to carry the matter farther than they; for being nearer to the diocese of Rome, he saw the danger so much the nearer, in which his flock were, of failing into idolatry.

Thirdly, That to go to the bottom of the matter, Agobardus, Archbishop of Lyons, pushed that point as far as Claudius himself; as appears from his treatise against pictures. It is a pleasure to see how Father Raynaud torments himself to justify Agobardus, whom the Church of Lyons honors as a saint, though he has made use of the same arguments that Claudius did, and given large testimonies of his being as vigorous an iconoclast as ever Claudius was. We may therefore assert, without rashness, that either all the fetches of Baronius and of F. Raynaud are not sufficient to keep Agobardus in the martyrology of Lyons; or, that they serve very profitably, at the same time, to enrol Claudius in that of the Church at Turin, as a

most holy and most illustrious Bishop, because of his doctrine, his ardent piety, and the great care he took to oppose the spirit of superstition, which reigned so much at that time.

Fourthly, After all, we may say, that neither Dungalus nor Jonas of Orleans maintained the opinion of the Church of Rome that was then: Jonas makes mention of the Pope's party., as a party not wholly cut off from the communion of the Church; but his expressions are so sharp, that it appears he had little better opinion of them. They condemn all manner of worship of images, and stick close to the decisions of Francfort, in the year 794, and of Paris, 826, which were diametrically opposite to the definitions of the iconolatras, or worshippers of images, and to the pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, who had admitted of them.

It was worth our while to take notice of these opinions of Claudius, and of the manner of his reforming his diocese, that we might make it appear, that he laid solid principles of the Reformation in those parts, as to several points. And this was the more necessary, because the Papists, as Genebrard, in his Chronology, and Rorengo, have owned, that the valleys of Piedmont, which did belong to the bishopric of Turin, preserved the opinions of Claudius in the ninth and tenth century.

We ought to observe two things, which very well deserve an exact reflection; the first is, that Angilbertus, Bishop of Milan, is constantly represented to us by Ripamontius, by Ughellus, and those who have wrote the history of that diocese, as one who began to separate himself from the Pope by a kind of schism, which they highly lament, as bordering upon rebellion, which they own to have lasted above two hundred years. But the case is not so as they are pleased to represent it to us: the truth is, that that Prelate preserved his liberty against all the Pope's endeavors, wherein he was imitated by his successors, who seem to have had no more value than he had for the Decretals of the ancient Popes, which were foisted in by the care and emissaries of the Roman see, in order to submit the rights and privileges of other Churches to her.

The second is, that though the emulation which was between the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia was an occasion of great contests between them, yet we find, that the diocese of Aquileia was no more united with that of the Pope, during the time of the controversy concerning the Procession, *ex utroque* [from both] under Nicolaus the First, and under Photius. This appears evidently from a letter of Photius, who having received at Constantinople a Bishop Legate from the Archbishop of Aquileia, wrote an answer to him, as to a man who was wholly of his opinion. Father Combefts has published this letter.

CHAPTER 10

The faith of the Churches of Italy in the tenth century.

Forasmuch as this century was generally devoted to ignorance and debauchery, and very barren of authors, it will be hard for us to inform ourselves any thing in particular concerning the Churches of Italy, except only so far as we make our conjectures of it by considering the condition of other western Churches, which was as deplorable as can well be imagined. This is owned by the Papists themselves, by Caranza, Genebrard, Baronins, and many more, who describe this tenth century as a monstrous age. Indeed, we can scarce expect that it should have been better at that time, if we consider the furious wars that wasted this diocese, as well by reason of the invasion of the Huns, as by the divisions happening between several princes, who endeavored to make themselves masters of that part of Italy, after the death of Charles the Great.

But Providence has preserved us two authors of this diocese; the one is Ratherius, who alone might have been sufficient to inform us very exactly about the state of Italy. This **RATHERIUS, BISHOP OF VERONA**, who, from being a monk in the abbey of Lobe, near to Liege, was advanced to the see of Verona, in the year 928, and being chased from thence in 932, was made Bishop of Liege in the year 954, and died in 974; so that he was Bishop during the most part of the tenth century.

Sigebertus informs us that the heresy of the Anthropomorphites began to appear again in the diocese of Italy during his pontificate, and that he was obliged to write against them. And indeed we find a large digression of Ratheflus upon this occasion in his first sermon of Lent. He observes, that the Priests of the diocese of Vicenza were of this opinion, which they grounded upon the following passages of Scripture, Psalm 33:16. Job 10:8. and Genesis 1:26. He acknowledges, that other people of his diocese were of the same opinion, and that they could no otherwise conceive the existence of God. He ingenuously confesseth, that this belief was grown in the minds of the people, because in the pictures and images they saw God seated like a king, on a throne, and the angels, in the shape of men with wings, arrayed in white. Behold here the happy effect of images upon an ignorant people, and what may be expected from these sort of books, which the Prophet Habakkuk so justly calls the teachers of lies.

He gives us an account in the same sermon of a very pleasant fancy of the people of his diocese: they believed that St. Michael the archangel celebrated the Mass of the second feria; whence they were persuaded, that the Mass of St. Michael, called the second feria, was far more excellent than any other Mass whatsoever. It is worth our observing, how he confutes this fantastical opinion. First, he maintains from Revelation 21:22 that there is no temple in heaven. Secondly, he proves, that the angels cannot celebrate Mass, because we ought not to believe, that the angels eat or drink corporeal bread and wine; and that Jesus Christ is only called the Bread of angels, because they are nourished with his praises, as with food. Be it as it will, it appears very plainly, that neither this gross people, nor their Bishops, who endeavored to disabuse them, were very well informed of the mysteries of the Church of Rome; for otherwise, why doth not this good Bishop tell his people, that the angels were not capable of the character of Priesthood? How could he object to them, that the angels cannot eat or drink corporeal bread and wine, but the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which exist therein in the manner of a spirit? Is it any contradiction to suppose, that spirits may truly receive a body which exists after the manner of a spirit? It is very plain, that though, may be, he might have embraced some of the hypotheses of Paschasius, which, through the stupidity of that people, were swallowed down by little and little, yet he did not know the whole of it. It was necessary, that Lanfranc, Guitmond, and Alger should make an end of licking this bear into some shape, as being but half formed by its author, when at first it was brought forth.

But not to insist longer on this, I observe two things: the first is, that this author, who had been brought up in a strange country, and who probably had brought along with him his notions from thence, seems in diverse points to follow the doctrine of Paschasius upon this question. The second is, that notwithstanding that, he doth up and down make use of a number of notions and expressions, which directly oppose and overthrow it.

On the one hand he tells the Priests of his diocese, in his Synodical Epistle, *Paranda cordium nostrorum habitacula, ventufo ad nos, per corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam, Christo* : We ought to prepare the habitations of our heart for Christ, who is to come into us, by the substance of his body and blood."

And on the other hand he tells us, that wicked Priests eat the goat, and not the lamb; which is also the expression of Odo Cluniacensis, who lived at the same time. An altogether incomprehensible expression in the mouth of a man that believes transubstantiation.

In his treatise of the Contempt of the Canons, par. 1. he quotes a passage of Zeno, Bishop of Verona, which overthrows transubstantiation. It is found in a sermon concerning Judah and Thamar, in these words: *Omniurn corrupte viventium Diabolus pater est; et O quam non manducat verendam camera Domini, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, in quo Diabolus per tria ista vitia, hoc est, superbiam, hypocrisin, atque luxuriam requiescit, licet communicate cum Sdelibus videatur, Domino dicente, Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo. Cure et per conversionem ira hoc possit resolvi ; Qui in me manet, et ego in eo, ipse manducat camera meam, et bibit sanguinem meum. In quo enim Deus manet, et ipse in Deo, quomodo in eo Diabolus dormire possit non video: dormit veto in eo qui per hypocrisin vel elationem umbrosus et vacuus, per luxuriam existit humectus. Quid ergo manducat, quando communicat. Judicium si respondes, Apostolo connives, et intelligere me pariter communes, quia pro eo judicabitur, id est, damnabitur, quia cum indignus existeret, Christi est ausus carnem manducare, et sanguinem bibere; ac propterea quod debuerat illi fore salvatio, est factum damnatio. De substantia vero corporali quam sumit, cure sit mea nunc quxstio, mihi nunc quoque ipsi loquar, ira succumbo; cure sit enim digne sumenti vera caro, panis licet quod dim ruerat videatur, et sanguis, quod vinum; indigne sumenti, id est, non in Deo manenti, quid sit, nedurn dicibile, incogitabile, fateor, mihi; et, Alitiora to ne quaesieris,*

"The Devil is the father of all those that live wickedly: and O how far is he from eating the venerable body of our Lord, and drinking his blood, in whom the Devil rests, by means of these three vices, pride, hypocrisy, and luxury, though he may seem to communicate with the faithful? Our Lord telling us, He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, abides in me, and I in him: which words may be translated thus; He who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that eats my flesh and drinks my blood. For he in whom God abides, and he in God, how the Devil can take up his rest in such an one, I see not: but the Devil doth rest in him, who by reason of hypocrisy and pride is shadowy and empty, and dissolved by luxury. What then doth such an one eat, when he communicates? If thou answerest, judgment, thou agreeest with the Apostle, and puttest me in mind to understand, that he shall therefore be judged that is condemned, because, being unworthy he durst venture to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood; and therefore that which was to have been his salvation, is become his damnation. But whereas my inquiry at present is concerning the bodily substance he receives, I must now answer myself, and own that here I am at a loss; for since it is true flesh to the worthy receiver, though it be the bread it was before, and blood, which yet is wine; what it is to the unworthy receiver, that is, to him who abides not in God, is so far, I confess from being expressible, that it is altogether inconceivable by me; and therefore in this case I ought to take that word as spoke to me, Do not seek after things too high for thee, nor search out things too deep for thee."

This seems to be very full; and yet, p. 182, he seems to believe with Paschasius, that it is the flesh of Jesus Christ, whosoever he be that receives it. But after all, the good man refers himself to the belief of St. Chrysostom, who calls the Sacrament a spiritual food, and to that of St. Austin, Tract. 61 et 62 in Johan. vid. p. 304.

Thus in his first Easter sermon, he supposeth, that the flesh of Jesus Christ is not received by the wicked, p. 310; and in his fourth sermon on the same subject, he asserts the contrary, p. 322.

Whatsoever may be his opinion in this matter in those writings I have before produced, he seems to have spoken more plainly in favor of the real change of the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, in his Epistle published by D'Achery, in the twelfth tome of his *Spicilegium*: but at the same time he gives this advantage, that he furnisheth us with a new defender of that figurative sense in the words of the Eucharist; for he clearly attributes to his friend, to whom he wrote, that he took the words in no other sense than as they are understood by the Protestants; upon which it is natural to take notice of two things; the first, that the disciples of Paschasius have had great trouble to oppose directly the opinion of St. Austin, who lays it down always, that only the faithful receive the body of Jesus Christ. The other is, that Gaufridus

Vindocinensis is perhaps the first who taught clearly (about the year 1100) that the wicked receive the body of Christ, as well as the faithful, against the constant doctrine of St. Austin, Tract. 26. in Johan.

We ought not to forget, that in his Perpendicular Volume, p. 183, he attributes the force of the consecration to prayer; which the Church of Rome at present condemns.

We may easily judge, that the Communion under both kinds was in vogue at that time; as appears from several places of his works.

But we are to observe, concerning this matter, First, that he expressly forbids private masses.

Secondly, That they kept still the custom, not to communicate on fast days, except in the afternoon, because the Communion broke the fast; so little were they of opinion at that time, that the substance of the bread and wine was lost and vanished by means of the consecration. Thirdly, That the custom of giving the Eucharist to laics, in order to carry it to the sick, was not yet abolished, though it began then to be condemned.

It is evident enough how much these articles oppose the belief of the Church of Rome. We may see, that the Church at that time did not take the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, since she believed that it could not be celebrated without communicants. The Church did not believe it to be only an heap of accidents, because she believed, that the taking of the Sacrament did break the fast. The Church of Rome could not leave the Sacrament in the hands of laics, after she had once made it the object of her adoration. But let us proceed to other articles about the Sacraments: seeing that Raterius lays down eight deadly sins, we may guess from thence, that he was not acquainted with the seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome, which have a reference to the seven sins, as the modern Divines of that communion assure us.

True it is, that he speaks of anointing the sick but as of an unction which was administered before the Communion of dying men, which has been prudently altered in the Pontificale Romanum, since they have thought fit to own Extreme Unction for the last of their Sacraments.

As to Baptism, and its necessity, it appears by his Synodical Epistle, that he was against having the custom abrogated of baptizing only on Easter-day and Whitsunday, except in case of necessity, that is, danger of death. As to the matter of penance, he would have the Priests invite the people to it, and that they may impose penances upon those who commit some secret sins; but he reserves to himself the power to impose penance upon public sinners; which shows that the ancient discipline was yet in practice: and he would have the Priests of his diocese to be furnished with a Paenitential, that they might follow the Canons thereof: so far was he from owning them for absolute judges, who could pronounce without appeal. He did indeed believe Purgatory, but after another manner than the Church of Rome doth: for he saith expressly, that it is only for slighter sins; whereas, according to the Papists, it is also appointed for the temporal pain of mortal sins: *Purgatorii poena non est statuta pro criminibus, sed pro peccatis levioribus, quae utique per lignum, faenum, et stipulam designantur*: "The punishment of purgatory is not appointed for crimes, but for lighter sins, which are intimated by wood, hay, and stubble." We shall now proceed to the examining of some other points, the better to inform ourselves of the state of this Church of Italy during the tenth century.

First, They believed that all Bishops in general were St. Peter's successors. Raterius is very express in this case: *Petri omnes Episcopi vicaria tenent in Ecclesiis*; "All Bishops are Peter's vicegerents in their Churches," and p. 168, 169, 173, and 229.

Secondly, They did not believe that the Pope had power to remove Bishops from one bishopric to another. The translation of Raterius from the see of Liege was done by order from the Emperor, and of a Council of Italy, assembled at Verona.

Thirdly, They were very sensible of the inconvenience of the sovereignty which the Pope endeavored to usurp over the Church. See what Raterius speaks of it: *Si Papa fit nequam, perjurus, adulter, venator, ebriosus, quid fiet de quaerimoniis ad ipsum delatis? Ridebitur, favebit sibi similibus*: "If the Pope

should prove a wicked man, perjured, an adulterer, a hunter, a drunkard, what will become of the complaints made to him? He will laugh at those that complain, and favor those that are like himself."

Fourthly, They without fear laughed at the Pope's excommunications and His anathemas, of which he began already to be very liberal. Ratherius gives us an instance of it in his *Apologetic*; *De quodam Clerico venalera illam, ut ait Salustius, adiens urbem, pretio, ut omnia antiquitus, ibi emptas quasi apostolicas dejarens chartas anathematis tam me, quam successores omnimodis meos mulctavit mucrone; ut fuivis abhinc Episcoporum si de Clericorum se infra mit teret rebus, perpetuo, ut aiunt, anathemate foret damnatus*: "Concerning one of the Clergy, who going to that city where all things were to be sold, as Salust expresses it, and bringing along with him the apostolical letters, bought for money, as of old, he smote me, as well as all my successors, with the edge of the anathematical sword; so that any Bishop from henceforward, that shall meddle with any matters concerning the Clergy, must expect to be condemned by a perpetual anathema."

We may see how he refutes this piece of folly.

Fifthly, They were yet in a doubt whether the title of Universal did of right belong to the Bishop of Rome: *Vestrae Paternitatis provolvens genius, Domine venerandissime, Archipraesul, Archiepiscopo, et, si de ullo mortali jure dici possit, Universalis Papa nominande*: "Prostrating myself at the knees of your Paternity, most reverend Lord, Archprelate Archbishop, and if it may of right be said of any mortal, Universal Pope."

Ratherius being banished from his Church, gives us a very ludicrous notion of it: *Ait, Taedet me esse Universalera Episcopure, id est, gyrovagum, et sine sede*; "It troubles me," saith he, "to be an Universal Bishop, that is, a wanderer about, without a see."

Sixthly, He appealed indeed to the Pope, concerning the unjust oppression he endured; but he appealed also at the same time to the Councils of Gaul, of Italy, and of Germany.

Seventhly, He takes notice that he did not go to Rome out of devotion, because it is said, John 4:21. The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, etc. but that he might be present at the Synod.

Some other points worth our observing are,

First, He deplores the general contempt of the Canons of the Church; a neglect which reigned from the Pope to the meanest of the people; *Luget generalera contemptum Canonum a laico ad Summum (pro nef asi) Pontificem*. He chargeth the Italians with being the most corrupt of all, by reason of their greater proneness to debauchery and vice; that the Doctors there neglected all discipline, insomuch as the Clergy did in nothing differ from the laity, but in their habits.

Secondly, **He observes, that most of the Clergy were either sodomites or adulterers**: *Ouam perdita tonsatorum universitas tota, si nemo in eis qui non adulter aut sit aut arseuquita!* "How profligate is the whole crew of shavelings, when there is none among them that is not either an adulterer or a sodomite!"

Thirdly, As for simony, it was so common, that he writes to the Bishop of Parma, to desire him to confer orders upon children for money no more, as he was wont to do. Manasses, Bishop of Milan, who had five bishoprics, sold that of Verona, and turned out Ratherius.

Fourthly, He takes notice of such extreme ignorance in the Priests of his diocese, that they could not so much as say the Apostles' Creed. And he chargeth his Priests, in his Synodical Epistle, to be able to say it without book, together with that of St. Athanasius.

Fifthly, He observes, that both Priests and people were Anthropomorphites.

Sixthly, He cannot dissemble the way which some of his Priests took to deceive souls, by maintaining that none that had been baptized could ever be damned.

Seventhly, Lastly **he exclaims, that Christianity was perished and gone:** Vera quo evasisti Christianitas? "True Christianity, whither art thou fled?" And he declares, that his time was that of which the Apostle spoke when he said, that many should depart from therewith.

This good Ratherius, in truth, had his share of the ignorance that reigned in his time, as well as of the superstition that had already seized upon many in Italy. Which ignorance of his appears,

1. In that he admits for true the false Decretals, which the Popes had foisted in, to subject all the world to themselves.
2. By his finding fault with the ordination of those persons who had been married more than once, as supposing they were forbid by the Apostle.
3. By his lamenting the liberty which was given to the Clergy to marry.
4. In that he joins the married Bishops with the most corrupt and profligate of that order.
5. By his charging the Clergy with a great crime, for having refused to obey the edict of the Emperor, which condemned the marriage of Ecclesiastics.
6. From his falsely pretending that marriage had been forbid to Ministers by the third Canon of the Council of Nice; whereas they maintained that they ought to use matrimony, to avoid falling into those enormous crimes which St. Paul hath set down in his first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.
7. From his expelling the married Monks out of his abbey, and placing Canons in their place.
8. From his prescribing some fasts to a woman that had married a Priest, without dissolving the marriage, or declaring it void.
9. From his commanding laics to abstain from their wives, and from flesh, twenty-eight days before Advent, and twenty days before Christmas.
10. From his severely blaming those who, instead of fasting forty days, fasted only twenty.

The second author that can give us any information concerning the state of the diocese of Italy, is **ATTO, BISHOP OF VERCEIL**, who, as Ughellus tells us, flourished about the middle of the tenth century. D'Achery has published several of his pieces in his Spicilegium, tom. viii.

We find in the Capitulary, which he addressed to the Priests of his diocese, almost all borrowed from that of Theodulphus, who was an Italian born, that he charged them to learn Athanasius's Creed, as a short compendium of the faith, upon pain of interdiction from wine for forty days; and to explain the Apostles' Creed to those that demanded Baptism; but doth not speak to them at all of other doctrines taught at present, as another part of religion.

He forbids the celebration of Masses without any communicants, and shows them that this is contrary to the Canon of the Liturgy.

He very severely condemns the custom of burying in churches; as likewise that of selling places to bury the dead in: though this custom was at first introduced by an opinion, that the dead received some help from the prayers of their relations.

He absolutely forbids the ordination of Priests without title; which shows that he did not look upon the trade of sacrificing the body of Jesus Christ to be so necessary and authorized, that for it he ought to dispense with the Canons, which are now laid aside, since the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is come in request.

He commands the Clergy to work with their hands, after reading and. prayer; which some ages after was condemned in the Waldenses; though therein he follows Theodulphus and the Rule of St. Bennet.

He will not have any thing read in the church, save the books of the Old and New Testament, and permits the passions of the martyrs to be read only on their anniversaries.

He condemns the custom of making baths of holy water, which was introduced into that country.

He hath one chapter about the case of the Eucharist that is fallen down, and concerning him that vomits again after three days; which plainly shows, that they supposed it to nourish really and truly, notwithstanding that it was consecrated bread.

It appears evidently, that public penance had not yet given place to the practice of confession to Priests; which has wholly abolished all the discipline of the Church of Rome.

He makes an extract of the Rule of St. Bennet, concerning the moral part of the Gospel; to which there is no Protestant but would be very willing to subscribe, as containing nothing of the spirit of monkery or of superstition.

He reduceth the matters of faith, which believers ought to know, to the Lord's Prayer, according to the Council of Forojulio, which I have already cited.

He maintains, according to the Canons of the Church of Rome, that the Scriptures are the foundation of religion, and doth not admit of the writings of the Fathers, but with this caution; Try all things, hold fast that which is good: and according to the Canon of Gelasius I. he ranks several books amongst the apocryphal writings, from whence the Church of Rome, some ages after, has borrowed diverse shreds to stuff out her Breviary, and their lives of saints.

We may now take a view of his doctrine in his treatise of the Judgments of Bishops. He maintains, that the Church is founded on the confession of the apostolic faith, and that she subsists by the faith and love of Jesus Christ, by the receiving of the Sacraments, and by the observation of our Savior's precepts. All the rest of that discourse, wherein he highly exalts the power of the Pope of Rome, is a plain sign that he was trepanned into the snare, which had been set a hundred and fifty years before, by a supposititious obtrusion of the false Decretals of ancient Popes, the end of which was to appropriate the cognizance of the trials of Bishops to the Pope, under pretense of preventing their oppression. In particular, he shows himself very angry against those who obliged the Bishops to terminate the quarrels they had with laics, by providing a champion to fight it out for them.

He pretends that the Scripture of the New Testament does absolutely forbid Christians to swear; which constitutes one of the errors of the Waldenses. He maintains, according to the doctrine of St. Ambrose, that it is not lawful for Bishops to take up arms, no, not for the Church's interest; which the Popes have practiced but very badly.

He seems to suppose, that the order of Bishops, and that of Presbyters, were not two different orders in St. Paul's time, and that they were distinguished afterwards.

He asserts, that laics have right to judge of the behavior of Bishops, as it is their right to have a share in their election.

He employs a whole treatise to confound the disorder which reigned at that time in the election of Bishops, as having no regard either to their charity or faith, but to the nobleness of their blood, and electing many that were yet mere children.

He declares in one of his letters, that some heresies were already crept into his diocese, which he had already hinted in the forty-eighth chapter of his Capitulary; and he seems to point at a branch of the Manichean heresy. He shows, that in his diocese they would not fast on Saturdays; which he finds fault with, notwithstanding the Saturday's fast was not known in St. Ambrose's time, in the diocese of Milan.

He quotes a law of the Lombards, to show that the marriage of a godson with his godmother was unlawful; and the definition he afterwards gives of marriage shows that he knew nothing of its being a sacrament.

He maintains, that the she-priests, of whom mention is made in the Canons, were the primitive Deaconesses, that they had power to teach in public, and that formerly they were employed to baptize maids or women; which Priests had married wives before they had received Orders, from whom they were to abstain afterwards.

Whoever will reflect upon what I have here said, and upon several other matters that might be observed, will easily judge, that both truth and piety began to decrease in this diocese, and that error and superstition, by little and little, began to take their places, in spite of the opposition of those whom God had raised up to stop their progress: however, the essentials of religion still continued there, notwithstanding these growing corruptions.

CHAPTER 11

An inquiry into the opinions of Gundulphus and his followers, before the year 1026

D'achery has published a Synod, which was held at Arras, by Gerard, Bishop of Cambray and Arras, in the year of our Lord 1025; by which it doth appear, that **GUNDULPHUS** had taught several doctrines in Italy, which had been carried by his disciples into the diocese of Liege and of Cambray in the Low Countries. This Synod having been held in the year 1025, we may easily judge that Gundulphus had a great number of disciples in Italy. The account Gerard gives to Reginaldus, Bishop of Liege, concerning the examination of these Italians, takes notice, First, That they had appeared before Reginaldus, who had examined them about their opinions, and had sent them back without condemning them. Secondly, That even then they employed the terror of punishments, against those who were suspected of heresy, to which Gerard attributes the seeming piety those Italians made show of: we may also gather this from Glaber, 1.4. c. 2. where he speaks of **a certain heresy discovered in Italy, and cruelly persecuted by the Bishops and the nobility of that country**. Thirdly, That they sent their disciples up and down to multiply the number of their followers, and that indeed they had withdrawn many from the opinions of Paschasius Ratbertus, which insensibly began to be established. Fourthly, That Gerard did in vain make use of violence, to make them confess their belief; and that he could not come to know it, but by those who had been gained by them. Fifthly, That he only gives an account in part of their opinions.

What may be gathered from Gerard's preface to Reginaldus, is this: First. They own themselves to be the disciples of one Gundulphus, who had instructed them concerning the evangelical and apostolical doctrine; that they received no other doctrine, and that they practiced the same verbo et opere, "in word and deed."

But since it had been reported to Gerard, that they abhorred Baptism, that they rejected the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Savior, that they denied the use of penance after sin, that they made void the Church, that they detested lawful marriages, that they owned no virtue in the holy confessors, and that they pretended that the Apostles only and Martyrs were to be revered; we find, that being interrogated upon these heads by Gerard, they answered distinctly, as follows:

First, To that which the Bishop told them, that Jesus Christ had established the necessity of Baptism, John, Except a man be born again, etc. they answer, *Lex et disciplina nostra quam a magistro accepimus, nec evangelicis decretis, nec apostolicis sanctionibus contra ire videbitur, si quis earn diligenter velit intueri. Haec namque hujusmodi est, roundurn relinquere, carnero a concupiscentiis frenare, de laboribus manuum suarum victum parare, nulli loesionem queerere, charitatem cunctis quos zelus hujus nostri propositi teneat, exhibere. Setrata igitur haec justitia, nullurn opus esse Baptismi; prevaricata vero ista, Baptismurn ad nullam procere salutare. Haec est nostra justificationis summa, ad quam nihil est quod Baptismi usus superaddere possit, cure omnis apostolica et evange-lica institutio hujusmodi fne claudatur. Si quis autem in Baptismate aliquod dicat latere Sacramenturn, hoc tribus ex causis evacuatur: Una, quia vita reproba Ainistrorum baptizandis nullurn potest praeberere salutis remedium. Atltera, quia quidquid vitiorum in fonte renuntiatur, postmodum in vita repetitur. Tertia, quia ad parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, fdei nescium, suxque salutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla regenerationis petitio, nulla fdei potest inesse confessio, aliena voluntas, aliena fdes, aliena confessio nequaquam pertinere videtur:*

"The law and discipline we have received from our master will not appear contrary either to the Gospel decrees or apostolical institutions, if carefully looked into. This discipline consists in leaving the world, in bridling carnal concupiscence, in providing a livelihood by the labor of our hands, in hurting nobody, and affording our charity to all who are zealous in the prosecution of this our design. Now if this righteousness be observed, there will be no need of Baptism; and if broken, Baptism cannot avail to salvation. This is the sum of our justification, to which the use of Baptism can superadd nothing, since this is the end of all apostolical and evangelical institutions. But if any shall say, that some sacrament lies hid in Baptism, the

force of that is taken off by these three causes: the first is, Because the reprobate life of Ministers can afford no saving remedy to the persons to be baptized. The second, Because whatsoever sins are renounced at the font, are afterwards taken up again in life and practice. The third, Because a strange will, a strange faith, and a strange confession do not seem to belong to, or be of any advantage to a little child, who neither wills nor runs, who knows nothing of faith, and is altogether ignorant of his own good and salvation in whom there can be no desire of regeneration, and from whom no confession of faith can be expected."

It appears by the Bishop's answer, wherein there are some good arguments to establish the necessity of Baptism, that these Italians were fallen upon these opinions, to put themselves at a greater distance from the maxims of their Priests, which I have taken notice of where I mention the belief of Ratherins. There is one thing observable about their other reasons; which is, that the Bishop objects to them, in order to persuade them of the necessity of Baptism, the custom of washing one another's feet, which they called *mandatum*; whence it is easy to judge, that they looked upon Baptism only as a mystical ceremony, the end of which was, to express the engagement of him who is baptized, and the vow he makes to live holily; which made them not to set any great value upon it, and to oppose themselves against the notion of the absolute necessity of Baptism, without which, the Priests of those times believed there was no attaining to salvation; as well as against the pretended efficacy of Baptism, so that whosoever received it could not fail of salvation.

The second head, upon which Gerard examined them, was the article of the carnal presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; he refutes their objections, which he makes to himself. The one is, That the body of Jesus Christ is in heaven since his ascension. The other, That the bodily eating of the body of Jesus Christ cannot profit, because Jesus Christ himself hath declared in the sixth of St. John, that the flesh profiteth nothing. The third is, That the body of Jesus Christ would no longer continue to be one entire body, being divided through so many places, and found in so many churches.

The chief heads of his answers to these objections are made up of apparitions, which he had extracted out of Paschasius's book; which plainly shows, that the Italians did not reject the sacrament of the Eucharist, but the doctrine of Paschasius, which began then to be established, though it met with great contradictions in the diocese of Italy, where Abbot Gezo had revived it, by publishing a book upon that subject; whereof Mabillon has given us an extract in his *Iter Italicurn*.

The third article concerns the consecration of churches: it appears, that they believed nothing of these sanctifications, which were attributed to sacred edifices and altars; but pretended that the prayers they made in the houses were no less agreeable to God, than if they had been made in the churches. The reason of this shyness they expressed to churches is evident, from their reproaching the idolatry that was practiced in them in point of images and other matters.

The fourth is about the altar, to which they refused to bow, or show any reverence, as the practice was then, after it was consecrated with holy oil; which is an evident sign that the thing they struck at was these consecrations, which they accused as superstitious: so far were they from looking upon them as a just motive to exhibit any honor or respect to the material things that had received them.

The fifth is of the same kind, concerning those censings which were then used in imitation of the ceremonies of the Mosaical law; the unction with oil, practiced upon those that were possessed, sick persons, and Catechumeni; and the anointing of bishops and Priests at their consecration.

The sixth is about bells; they finding fault with the virtue which was attributed to their sound, viz. of driving away tempests and the Devil's power.

The seventh article concerns the different orders of Ministers; these Italians being accused of rejecting them, because they gave the imposition of hands in private, and blamed the Ministry, such as it was received in the western Church; and that by this means they took upon them ecclesiastical functions, being themselves secular persons.

The eighth is about burial in consecrated places, which these Italians looked upon only as an effect of the covetousness of Priests, who could imagine no other advantage in being buried in holy places, but that of selling them the dearer to the people, whom they had abused by this notion of holiness inherent in one place more than another.

The ninth respects penance after Baptism, which, according to Gerard's accusation of them, they rejected; which seems to agree with the opinion of the Novatians: but we may easily judge that the thing they chiefly struck at were those penal works which began then to be imposed, as in order to satisfy the Divine justice.

This appears more clearly from the tenth article, which shows that what they struck at were customs and usages of the Church of Rome. Thus he accuses them of asserting, that penance was of no use after death; whereas Gerard maintains, that the works of the living, alms, masses, and the satisfactions which persons imposed upon themselves for the dead, were indeed of great efficacy for the salvation of the deceased. It appears clearly, from the proofs of Gerard, that they struck at the doctrine of purgatory, and those practices which this belief had introduced into the Church.

The eleventh article accuseth them for looking upon lawful marriage as an abomination, and a state wherein it was impossible to be saved.

The twelfth article accuseth them for refusing to give any veneration to confessors, and reserving it only for Apostles and Martyrs; and for maintaining, that there was no virtue in the dead bodies of saints, after they are once returned to dust; which Gerard refutes by an examination of the miracles performed by every Bishop of his diocese, before the people brought to the tombs the marks of their veneration of any confessors.

The thirteenth article accuseth them for finding fault with the singing of Psalms, which was then received in the Church, under a pretense that those that so made use of them were thereby obliged sometimes to curse themselves, by their repeating the imprecations contained in the said Psalms.

The fourteenth article was about their refusing to reverence the cross, maintaining that it had no virtue at all, as being only a work of men's hands.

The fifteenth article concerned the image of our Savior on the cross, that of the blessed Virgin, and those of the saints and angels, etc. which they refused to worship.

The sixteenth respects the obedience which they were said to refuse to the Ministers of the Church, to Bishops, Archdeacons, Deans, and Praepositi; the model of which government they pretended to derive from the angelical hierarchy treated of by Dionysius the Areopagite.

The seventeenth concerns the righteousness they arrogated to themselves because of their good works, as if they had renewed the doctrine of Pelagius; to which Gerard opposeth the notions of St. Austin, and the necessity of adhering to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as being that which St. Peter preached at Rome, and which his successors have propagated throughout all the west.

These are the opinions which Gerard made these Italians abjure, who, as the Acts of the Synod tell us, were convinced and confounded by the refutation he had made of their errors. The Acts of the Synod contain the abjuration of these opinions. They acquaint us moreover, that these Italians, pretending not to understand the contents of this excommunication, because it was writ in Latin, it was explained to them in Italian, and they were made to sign it, and to set a sign of the cross before their names.

It is worth our observing,

First, That what they were made to own was not subscribed by them, till after they had been three days in prison; having been committed by order of the Bishop.

Secondly, **That all this confession was extorted by fear of punishment**, wherewith they had been threatened at Liege, and afterwards at Arras.

Thirdly, **That it seems not altogether improbable, that they differed about some of these opinions amongst themselves**, as may be very naturally gathered from the history of the following ages, and yet they are all involved in the same excommunication: thus without fear did they treat people who did not understand Latin, and who were obliged to express their mind by interpreters.

Fourthly, **That they were not made to confess any thing that savours of Manicheism, except the matter of marriage.**

Fifthly, That the errors whereof they were accused seem to take their birth from an inclination very natural to the mind of man, who is very prone to cast himself upon the opposite extremity, whilst he endeavours to separate himself from errors. St. Cyprian rebaptized those who had been baptized by heretics; Stephen received the Baptism of all heretics without distinction. Several dioceses were divided amongst themselves, by reason of these contrary practices above eighty years, until the convening of the first Council of Arles, which yet was not able wholly to compose this difference.

Gundulphus seeing them assert, that whosoever was baptized could never be damned, falls to an indifference for Baptism, thinking it sufficient to keep to the essentials of that sacrament. And the same we are to suppose of their Anabaptism, and some other of their articles.

Sixthly, That we find in this their doctrine the substance of those articles, which the Waldenses have condemned in the faith and worship of the Church of Rome.

Seventhly, And as to the imputation of their finding fault with the hierarchy of the Church, this proceeded indeed from nothing else, but from the abuse which was then so customary in the western Churches, and of Italy in particular, as I have just now made out concerning the tenth century; and the multiplication of ecclesiastical offices into so many different orders appeared to them to be very opposite to the institutions of the primitive Church.

This being laid down, I say we have already found a body of men in Italy, before the year 1026, who believed contrary to the opinions of the Church of Rome, and who highly condemned their errors; a body of men which sent its members about into divers places, to oppose themselves to the superstitions that reigned throughout all the west.

I shall, in the sequel of this discourse, show the reason why they were accused of being mere seculars; and shall make it appear, that at the bottom this was nothing else but a pure calumny, founded upon an unjust prejudice.

CHAPTER 12

Reflections upon some practices of the Churches of the diocese of Italy

What I have already represented in the foregoing chapters makes it evident, as far as can be desired, that the diocese of Italy, in faith as well as worship, had the purity necessary to constitute a true Christian Church. I own that we find in it some errors and some superstitions; the account I have already given being a full proof thereof. But I have farther to observe,

First, That their Liturgy contains nothing that favors these errors or superstitions; now we know, that we ought to judge of a Church by the public writings of religion.

Secondly, That though several private men, or even some of the Clergy, were involved in these errors or superstitions, this must not be made use of to the prejudice of the whole diocese.

Thirdly, We find that at that very time the ablest and learnedest men amongst them did vigorously set themselves against these errors and these superstitions of a blind people and an ignorant Clergy.

These general remarks ought in particular to be applied to these following articles.

The first is, Prayer for the Dead.

2. Doting on the relics of saints.

3. The custom of praying to saints.

4. The too rigorous injunction of fasts, fixed to certain days.

5. The too great esteem they had of the celibacy imposed upon Ecclesiastics.

These are the most ancient of their superstitions. We find also, that in process of time the use of images, and some gross notions of the carnal presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, were introduced into this diocese.

I own that prayer for the dead was used in this diocese even before the fourth century; but withal I find it was practiced there under another notion than it is in the Church of Rome, which since Gregory I. has founded the belief of it wholly upon the doctrine of purgatory, is unknown to all the Churches of the East.

First, They prayed to God in general, that he would be pleased to make those partakers of the resurrection whom he had taken out of this world, which we approve of, and which we do as often, as by the kingdom of God, the coming of which we pray for, we understand the kingdom of glory, which is to destroy death, the last enemy of believers.

Secondly, They begged of God another kind of resurrection, which they conceived that God had promised to some believers, who particularly had the privilege of being admitted into the kingdom of Jesus Christ upon earth. This was nothing else but a consequence of the opinion of the most ancient Christians concerning the millennium. Thirdly, They joined to this, the notion of the deliverance from the fire of the last judgment, through which many of the ancients were of opinion that all believers, the blessed Virgin and Apostles not excepted, were to pass.

The state of souls before the resurrection being very uncertain in ancient times, and the Fathers taking unto themselves the liberty to philosophize upon that subject, in a very different manner, as the learned of the Romish Church do confess: these things have given occasion to the rise of prayers for the dead; and though their opinions in this matter have been very different, yet they are all of them furnished with essential marks to distinguish them from those of the Church of Rome, in respect of their opinions; as those of the Church of Rome differ much in regard of their opinions from the words of the ancients which they make use of on this occasion, and which are, for the most part, of a considerable antiquity. I own likewise, that the veneration of relics appeared in this diocese from before the end of the fourth century, and since that, by little and little, got strength there, as it is customary for human inventions to attain to their full growth by degrees. The piety of the primitive Christians contented themselves with burying the bodies of believers and martyrs, and at their internment solemnly blessed God that he had taken them to his peace and refreshment. When the Church found themselves under persecution, they met together in the churchyards, or burying-places which gave occasion to the Pastors to discourse to the faithful, concerning the constancy of the martyrs: afterwards they celebrated the Eucharist upon their very tombs: and some time after, towards the end of the fourth century, they brought in a custom, not to consecrate any church, without putting first some relics of martyrs under the altar. This is what we find was practiced by St. Ambrose, with so much pomp, in reference to the relics of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius, and which he believed founded upon a revelation. In process of time, they took care to fill the churches with the bodies of martyrs, those of whom no relics were to be found being in a manner quite forgot. They followed herein a Pagan opinion, which supposeth the souls of the deceased to be tied to their graves. They took occasion to consider the prayers made to God in the presence of these tombs, as being made in the communion of the martyrs there present. They wished that these believers, being delivered from temptations, might intercede, together with them, by an act of their first charity: and so, by little and little, they began to address their prayers to them themselves. Matters stood thus, when the famous Bishop of Turin set himself against these innovations with a great deal of vigor and zeal, founded upon the doctrine of Scripture, and upon the opinions of St. Austin.

As for what concerns their fasts, I do own, that besides that fast which was anciently observed before Easter, from the fourth century, there have been some other fasts fixed to certain days, as were those that were kept on the same account with the former, for the solemn Baptism of the Catechumeni; those which accompanied the ordination of the Ministers of the Church, and some others. But, first, we are to observe, that the Church in those times did not make a meritorious and satisfactory work of fasting, as it has been made some ages since. Secondly, We cannot deny but that they were kept then in good earnest, they consisting in a total abstinence from eating or drinking; whereas at present they consist only in a distinction of meats. Thirdly, That after all that can be said, the Church then considered fasting only as an indifferent action, which was to be backed and seconded by the motion of a true contrition and humility, without which it could not be well pleasing to God; which is quite contrary to what has been conceived of it in these later times.

We cannot deny, but that a single state was observed by the Clergy of Milan, in the time of St. Ambrose: this appears from his first Book of Offices, chap. 50, where he expressly tells us, that those to whom he speaks had received Orders, being, *alieni ab ipso consortio conjugali*, "strangers to conjugal fellowship."

But we are to take notice, first, that in the same place he owns, that in most other places of less renown, the Priests and Bishops were married, and had children. Secondly, that they maintained this custom in imitation of the Priests under the law, who were not bound to forbear the company of their wives, save only during the time of their ministry. Thirdly, That they maintained, that the people of old were also obliged to abstain from their wives for some few days, in order to their partaking of the sacrifices. The words of St. Ambrose on this occasion are these: *Quod eo non praeterii, fuia in plerisque abditioribus locis, cure ministerium gererent, vel etiam sacerdotium, filios susceperunt, et id tanquam usu veteri defndunt, quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium offerebatur: et tamen castigabatur etiam populus per biduum vel triduum, ut ad sacrificium purus accederet, ut in Feteri Testamento leglinus, et lavabat vestimenta sua. Si in Sgura tanta observantia, quanta in veritate,* "Which, therefore I did not pass by, because in more retired places, those that discharged the office of Levites or Priests did beget children; and this they maintain from what was in use under the old law, when they offered sacrifices with some intervening distance of time; and yet even the people themselves were to use abstinence for two or three days, that they might with the greater purity come to the sacrifice, according as we read in the Old Testament, and to wash their garments. If so strict an observance were used in the figure, how much more in the truth itself!"

Whence it appears, first, **That the greater part of the Clergy of the diocese of Milan were not bound to observe the law of celibacy**, which Paphnutius had hindered the Council of Nice from imposing upon the Bishops and other ministers. Secondly, That though the Clergy of Milan lived in a single state, yet this was not by virtue of any law, but of their own grace, and without any necessity. Thirdly, That the cause of St. Ambrose's so highly recommending the celibacy of ministers, was the high esteem he had for the single state. Fourthly, That it was a gross imposture of Petrus Damianus, to maintain, as he did before the Clergy of Milan, that St. Ambrose not being able to reduce his Clergy to a single state, had been obliged to implore the assistance of Syriacus, to bring it about, and that he had declared he would follow the Church of Rome in that particular, as being his mistress. I know very well that he cites for this the book *De Sacerdotali Dignitate*; which he attributes to St. Ambrose, but with so little justice, that that alone is sufficient to lay open the impudence wherewith he abused the credulity of the people of Milan.

This we may clearly gather from his 82nd Epistle, written to the Church of Verceil, where after having given the sense of the words of St. Paul, which concern the virtues of Mirlisters, he adds, *Haec posui quae cavenda acceperim. Virtutum autem magister Apostolus est, qui cure patientia redarguendos doceat contradicentes, qui unius uxoris virum precipiat esse, non quo ewsorem excludat conjugii, ham hoc supra legem precepti est, sed ut conjugali castimonia server ablutionis suae gratiam. Neque irerum ut filios ereare Apostolica invitefur auctoritate, habentem enim dixit filios, non facientem.* "I have here set down what I understand ought to be avoided. Now the Apostle is a master of virtue, who teacheth, that gainsayers ought to be reprov'd with patience, who commands a Presbyter to be husband of one wife, not as if he would thereby exclude those that live in a single state; for that is something above the command of the law; but that in conjugal chastity he might preserve the grace received in Baptism; nor, as if thereby the Apostle would invite him by his authority to beget children, for the words of the Apostle are, having children, not begetting them."

Which expressly proves, first, That the Bishop or Priest, who continues with his wife in the conjugal band, does not therefore cease to keep his baptismal purity. Secondly, That, according to him, the Apostle did no more deny Bishops the liberty of marrying, than he granted it to them. It is difficult to determine what were the opinions of Servatianus and Barbatianus, of whom St. Ambrose makes mention in that 82nd Epistle. He tells us, that they came out of the monastery of Milan, whence they betook themselves to Verceil; he accuseth them for asserting, that virginity and fasting did not deserve any greater praise than the state of marriage and the ordinary way of living. He aggravates this indictment, by accusing them of permitting fornication, and asserting it not to be inferior to the state of virginity or lawful marriage; whereupon he endeavours to prove the contrary, as being the doctrine of the Church, and of the Scripture. But in all this we may perceive something of immoderate zeal, wherewith the love of celibacy is apt to inspire those that maintain it. I will not accuse St. Ambrose for imitating the extravagance of Syriacus, in his Epistle to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragon, writ in 385, where he makes use of these words of St. Paul, Those who are in the flesh cannot please God. As if all married people, were in the flesh, according to the Apostle's meaning. But I cannot avoid observing, first, That St. Ambrose seems to have imputed to Servatianus and Barbatianus, as their true opinions, the consequences which he himself had drawn from them, this being a method which an ungoverned zeal does often put men upon, against those whom they believe to be out of the way. Secondly, I say, that if the case were otherwise, St. Ambrose would scarce have been excusable, for having acted so mildly against Servatianus and Barbatianus. How could he have done less than excommunicate them, and represent them to the Church of Verceil, as such who ought to be excommunicated, for opposing the principles of Christianity, or as those who ought to be rejected, for having been justly excommunicated at Milan. Indeed, whosoever shall be pleased to make an unprejudiced reflection upon this history, will hardly be able to persuade themselves otherwise, but that there is a great deal said only to aggravate, in this discourse of St. Ambrose; but at the same time, whatsoever he might have alleged, they will conceive, that these Monks were offended to see men begin to set too high an esteem upon the state of virginity and abstinence, and that this had obliged them to speak of them with a kind of undervaluing and indifference, and to oppose themselves against the prejudice that was then beginning to take root and be established.

I say, that this prejudice began then to be established; for we find that the Council of Turin, celebrated a little after St. Ambrose's death, doth absolutely forbid the promoting of a married Deacon to the priestly office, or a married Priest to that of a Bishop. True it is, that it seems that this Canon was not exactly observed; for we find several examples of Priests and Bishops, who probably had passed through these first orders, their marriage proving no obstacle to their promotion.

However it be, in process of time, this rigor, which concerned only the Clergy, was slackened in this diocese, as I have made it appear. As also there happened no considerable change, till about the tenth century, when the barbarous nations having overwhelmed that diocese, as well as the greatest part of the west, the Bishops were found to be stupid enough to admit the false Decretals of the Pope, which some impostor had published as a means to overthrow the ancient discipline, and to subject the west to the Romish see. In the time of Alexander II. and Gregory VII. who could afford no better names to married Priests than that of Nicolaitans, Servatianus and Barbatianus would have been handled quite after another manner than they were by St. Ambrose; which makes it evident enough, what the opinion of the Church was at the time when this question first appeared. It is well known, that in succeeding times the Monks that had broken their vows and renounced their oath were obliged to do penance; but we find nothing like this in St. Ambrose's time. The reason is, because a convent at that time was a matter of choice, which might be quitted without any other punishment, but the imputation of imprudence, for not having sufficiently considered fully of that kind of life, before they engaged themselves therein.

Furthermore it is good to observe, that the rashness and imprudence of those, who thus quitted this state, seemed the less pardonable, because they did not admit persons to sacred Orders that were very young, as we do now, but only men of an age sufficient to know their own constitution, and to know whether they were able to observe that kind of life which they voluntarily had taken upon them.

But what I have already observed may suffice to make it evident, that the state of religion in the diocese of Italy was not so far corrupted, but that we may own it to be a Church pure enough, and which, in respect of the most understanding of its members, and that in public too, had preserved the true faith and the true worship which the Christian religion prescribes to us.

Our business at present is to show, that this Church was independent on the power of the Pope of Rome; after which, we shall consider its separation from the Pope, when he endeavored to subject it to his authority.

CHAPTER 13

That the diocese of Italy was an independent diocese, till after the midst of the eleventh century

In order to the thorough establishing of this truth, I intend to make it appear, that this is not only certain with respect to those times when the Popes were not very considerable, but also with respect to that time when the Popes began to lift up themselves by the favor of Gratian, and after him of Valentinian III.

To this purpose it will be of use to set forth, as well the constitution of the Church, as the manner in which the diocese of Milan did continue independent until the midst of the eleventh century, at which time the Waldenses were obliged more openly to testify their aversion for the Church of Rome as an Antichristian Church. It will be easy enough for me to perform what I have proposed to myself, in following the history of the Church.

Before the Council of Nice, we find the diocese of Italy very distinct from that of Rome, which contained the suburbicary Churches: of this we have two unquestionable proofs; the one of which we find in the case of Paulus Samosatenus, Bishop of Antioch, where the Emperor Aurelian distinguisheth the Bishops of Italy from those of Rome, by his referring equally to them the decision of Samosatenus's opinions, whether they were to be looked upon as orthodox or not.

The other we meet with in the business of the Donatists; where Constantine, to put an end to the differences which divided the African Churches, appointed them judges as well from Rome as from Italy: Meroeles, Bishop of Milan, as head of his diocese, being nominated by the Emperor, as well as Melehiades.

The Council of Nice confirmed this ancient custom of the Metropolitans, who had enjoyed the right of convening the synods of their diocese, and ordaining the Bishops belonging to the same. This we see in the sixth Canon: each diocese then formed a council, which was called by the Metropolitan. Every Metropolitan ordered the affairs of his diocese, all matters were regulated by this council, and there was no appeal from their judgments. So that the Canon of the Council of Nice served instead of a law, as well in the east as the west; and which might have served so still, if the ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople and of Rome had not overthrown this so wise a regulation. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, maintains, that this Canon did also constitute every diocese so far independent on any of its neighbours, that they could not take any cognizance of matters that were without their limits. This we find in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus.

We find that since that time, the thing continued on the same foot: many proofs might be given of it, but I shall content myself with these following:

1. St. Athanasius distinguisheth Milan and Rome as two independent Churches.
2. The election of St. Ambrose is related to us by Theodoret, lib. 4. cap. 5, 6. as done without any consent of the Bishop of Rome; which could not have been so, had he been the Patriarch of Italy.

The business of the Priscillianists, who had recourse to St. Ambrose as well as to Damasus, after that they had been rejected by the Spanish Bishops at Coesaraugusta, is a certain proof hereoff

If we read the history of the following centuries, we shall not find that ever any Bishops of Italy' were ordained by the Popes, or were subject to their councils, till the eleventh century.

We find that the Council of Italy, in which St. Ambrose presided, approve, in their letter sent to Theodosius, the proceedings about the election of Maximus, in opposition to the opinion of Damasus and his council: so far were they from depending on the Pope as their Patriarch. We find the same thing also acknowledged by those of Africa, who sent Legates as well to the Bishop of Milan, as to the Bishop of Rome. We find the same thing in the year 431; Theodoret addressing himself to the Bishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, against the Chapters of Cyril, which Pope Celestine had approved.

We find in the year 451. Pope Leo I. so fully owning this truth, that he writes to the Bishop of Milan, that he would be pleased to approve in his synod the letter which the said Pope wrote to Flavianus, upon the incarnation of the Word, against the errors of Eutyches. We find Flavianus appealing to the Pope and the Bishop of Milan by name, as well as to the rest of the western Metropolitans.

We find in the year 556 that the diocese of Milan, and its Bishops, stood resolutely to the party that rejected the Fifth General Council; and though Pope Pelagius strongly solicited Narses to reduce them to his opinion by violence, yet he could never obtain his desire, as may be seen by St. Gregory's Epistles: and the Church of Aquileia, and some others of Italy, above an hundred years after, had no communion with the Church of Rome, as Baronius himself ingenuously confesseth.

We find in the year 679 a Council of Italy assembled upon occasion of the Monothelites, wherein the Bishops of this diocese alone writ to Constantine the Emperor; which sheweth their independence on the Pope, who wrote also in particular with his Council.

And last of all, we do not find that since the seventh century the Church of Rome has had that authority over the diocese of Italy, which she arrogated to herself over other Churches, where she had already gained some preeminence by means of her Vicars.

We have an unquestionable proof of what I here allege in the Diurnus Romanus. All the Bishops that belonged to the Pope's jurisdiction, by reason of their being in his diocese, were obliged to swear, at their ordination, that they would follow the rites and the divine service of the Church of Rome. Now we know that the Church of Milan had its own peculiar Liturgy, called the Ambrosian. It is true, they pretend that after Charles the Great had made himself master of the kingdom of the Lombards, he endeavored to abolish the same; and some think it received a great change at that time: but this is only conjecture without ground; for, excepting some slight alterations caused by time, at a juncture when Popery had well nigh got the mastery there, that Liturgy continued much the same as it was before.

We find the same independence of the Church of Milan in the ninth and tenth century acknowledged by Ughellus in the Life of Angilbertus: Angilbertus Pustrella ejusdem nominis superiori successit 827. *Hic ille Angilbertus est, quem tantae dignitatis corruptit foelicitas, cum aliquamdiu moderatione antea usus, prudenter Mediolanensem administrasset Ecclesiam: suffultus enim (ut quidam narrant) Magni Caroli privilegiis et gratiis, charusque Ludovico Pio Imperatori, Lotharioque ejusdem filio, a Romana Ecclesia ita defecit, ut, perinauditam superbiam, cum Romano Pontifice de potestate deque dignitate decertare non verecundaretur. Pessimum exemplum ita ad successors pertransiit, ut per ducentos ipsos annos ea contumacia illos abduxit infeceritque.* "Angilbertus Pustrella succeeded his predecessor, of the same name, in the year 827. This is that Angilbert, whom the splendor of so high a dignity corrupted after having used moderation for some time, he had prudently governed that Church: for being upheld (as some tell us) by the privileges and favors of Charles the Great, and being dear to the Emperor Ludovicus Pius, and Lotharius his son he made a defection from the Roman Church, as not being ashamed to contend with the Pope of Rome about power and dignity. This bad example of his passed over to his successor: so that for two hundred years together they were led astray and infected by this contumacy."

We are not to admit that which Ughellus would fain insinuate, that this was a rebelling against his Patriarch. This is a mere illusion. It was only a resistance of the enterprises of the Popes, who, being encouraged by the easiness and ignorance of divers western Prelates, did boldly invade those rights which did not at all belong unto them. For we find that, eight years after his election, Angilbert assisted at the Council of Mantua with the Pope's Legates, without their preferring any complaint against him, which they would not have failed to have done, especially being supported by the authority of Lotharius the Emperor, if Angilbert's right had not been evident.

And indeed it was not till the year 1059, that Nicolas II. under pretense of putting a stop to the simony in that diocese, and to condemn the Nicolaitanism, (for this was the name which at that time was bestowed on the marriage of Priests,) sent Petrus Damianus, and Anselre, Bishop of Lucca, to Milan, who subjected that diocese, obliging them to receive the laws of the Pope's synod, whereas before they had only owned the laws of the (Ecumenical Councils, wherein they had assisted by their deputies, according to the protestation of Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna. We have a certain proof hereof in the discourse of the Clergy of Milan with Petrus Damianus; for they maintain, "That the Ambrosian Church, according to the ancient institutions of the Fathers, was always free, without being subject to the laws of Rome; and that the Pope of Rome had no jurisdiction over their Church, as to the government or constitution of it."

We may here take notice how Claudius, Bishop of Turin, behaved himself with respect to Pope Paschal, with whose being offended at him Theodemirus had reproached him, willing to recommend to him the Pope's authority.

The matter was so clear and evident, that Pope Honorius II. being desirous to make Anselm, Archbishop of Milan, own his authority, who was chosen in the year 1123, and to give him the pail, he refused it, in the year 1125, for fear of subjecting his Church to that of Rome. See how Landulphus, c. 38, relates the matter, as we find it set down by Ughellus: *Anselmus Pustrella, hujus nominis quintus Archiepiscopus, adlectus est anno 1123. De profectione ejusdem Roman ad Honorium II. Anno 1125, ac de iis quae ibi peregit, haec Landulphus, capitulo 38: Sed cum idem Archiepiscopus, sectus consilium quorundam Capellanorum et Primicerii, Petri vero Terdonensis Episcopi, contra publicum interdictum Cleri et populi Medialanensis, Romam ivit: mihi quidem non sedit...Veruntamen ipse, ceu vir prudens et sapiens, cum papa Honorio et Cardinalibus ejus multa contulit, et conferendo ecclesiasticas consuetudines Ambrosianae Ecclesiae, et honores ejus archiepiscopatus et urbis, vivis et bonis rationibus defendit. Unde ipse Papa huic prudenti viro dixit, Frater, mediatatus et Episcopus venisti: sed si vis frui autoritate Archiepiscopi in temporibus meis, necesse est ut stolam suscipias e manibus meis, aut, sicut dgo suscepi, ad altare Sancti Petri. Hinc dominus iste Mediolanensis Roboaldus Albensem adjuravit, ut sibi consulere. Tunc Roboaldus ille Albensis sic ait, quod prius sustineret nasum suum scindi usque ad oculos, quam daret sibi consilium ut susceperet Romae stolam, et Ecclesiae Mediolanensi praeparet hanc novam et gravissimam, quam Honorius Papa dicebat sibi, imponere mensuram. Mediolanum igitur ipse Archiepiscopus sine stola rediit, et eundem Albensem Episcopum secum reduxit. Verum Archiepiscopalem sedem non ascendit, donec Ubtertus de Meregnano, ejus scribe, juravit quod ipse dominus suus Anselmus nulli minutione honoris Ecclesiae Mediolanensis consensit, et quod ipsum Albensis ille Episcopus Roboaldus auctoritate sua confirmavit. Diende Pontifex iste Anselmus sedem et castella archiepiscopatus in beneficio Cleri et populi recuperavit.*

"Anselmus Pustrella, the fifth of that name, was chosen Archbishop in the year 1123. Concerning whose journey to Rome, to Honorius II. in the year 1125, and what he did there, Landulfus gives us this account, chapter 38: But when the said Archbishop, following the counsel of some of his chaplains, and of his Primicerius, and of Peter, Bishop of Terdon contrary to the public prohibition of the Clergy and people of Milan, was gone to Rome.... However he, as a prudent and wise man, conferred at large with Pope Honorius II. and his Cardinals in which conference he with brisk and good arguments asserted the customs of the Ambrosian Church, with the prerogatives of that archbishopric and city. Whereupon the Pope said to this prudent man, Brother, you that are a Bishop come hither well provided with arguments; but if you have a mind to enjoy the archiepiscopal dignity during my time, it is needful that you receive the pall from my hands, or, as I myself have received it, at the altar of St. Peter. Then the Bishop of Milan conjured Roboaldus, Bishop of Alba, to advise him in this ease; whereupon the Bishop answered, that he would rather suffer his nose to be slit up to his eyes, than advise him to receive his pall at Rome, and thereby subject the Church of Milan to that new and hard measure which Pope Honorius designed to impose upon her. Wherefore the Archbishop Anselm returned to Milan without his pall, and brought the Bishop of Alba back with him. Nevertheless he did not place himself in the archiepiscopal scat, until Ubtertus de Meregnano, his secretary, had sworn that his lord Anselm had not consented to the least diminution of the prerogatives of the Church of Milan; and the same also Roboaldus, Bishop of Alba, confirmed by his authority. And after this Archbishop Anselm recovered his seat, and the castles of his archbishopric, which were at the disposal of the Clergy and people."

I know only of two or three objections about this matter, which deserve to be considered. The one is, the prejudice the Popes have endeavored to foment, some ages since, as if they were the Patriarchs of all the West; in consequence whereof their flatterers have endeavored to make the world believe, that the suburbicary Churches, whereof mention is made in the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice, do signify the Churches of all the West. But this is so foolish an imagination, that it is strange that men of any learning should suffer themselves to be imposed upon by it. The second is, that we find that sometimes the Bishops of the diocese of Milan have met in synods with the Pope and his council, as if they had belonged to his patriarchate. The third is, that Ughellus relates, from time to time, in the catalogue he has given us of the Bishops of Milan, that such and such a one were confirmed by the Pope, and received the pall at his hands. But it will be easy to refute all these objections fully. First, as for that conceit, that the Pope was Patriarch of the West; it is a thing unheard of by all antiquity: and indeed, if Leo the First, on the one hand, had known himself invested with this right, he would never have ingenuously confessed, as he has done in his Epistles, that he did not pretend to ordain the Bishops that were amongst the Gauls, which notwithstanding would have belonged to his jurisdiction, in case he had been Patriarch of the West; and on the other hand he would have made use of this prerogative, in his request to the younger Valentinian, when he endeavored to procure for himself the right of appeals, which was contested with him, as being an unjust and novel right.

As for what concerns the union which sometimes has been made between the Synod of Italy and that of Rome, this cannot be made use of as an argument in this case; for the Prelates of Italy have assisted at the synods that have been held amongst the Gauls, without subjecting themselves to the Gauls in the least thereby, or without subjecting the Gauls to Italy. We have an example hereof in the Synod of Turin, in the year 397, where the Gauls assisted, because the business of that synod was to remedy the common disorders, which equally reigned in the neighboring dioceses, which maintained ecclesiastical communion one with another.

And as for that which Ughellus saith, that several Bishops of Milan have received the pall, and been confirmed by the Popes of Rome; I confess that Ripamontius cites a letter of St. Gregory's to Lawrence, Bishop of Milan, by which he sends the pall to him. But without entering into the examination of what this concession did import, we are to observe, first, that this pall was no more than a politic subtilty of the Court of Rome, to establish amongst the barbarous and stupid western people the edict of Valentinian the Third, in favor of appealing to the see of Rome; an edict which could be no longer of force after the dissipation of the Roman empire. Secondly, that at the bottom, this concession signifies little else, as Hinemar has very well observed with respect to all the Pope's privileges, save that the Pope did not take away a right, whereof those to whom he granted the privilege were already in full possession. Thirdly, that though the thing should be really so, yet it took place so little, by reason of the condition wherein that diocese has been since the Popes have made use of this snare, that the ecclesiastical liberty of that diocese has been little or nothing concerned in it. We know, in the fourth place, that this granting of the pall has not taken place, save only with some ambitious Bishops, and not with all, as Ughellus assures us, but without any proof; as likewise when he asserts, that it was Gregory the First who granted to them the right of crowning the kings of Italy. This Ughellus was indeed nothing else but a relater of fables, who does not deserve any credit amongst learned men, though the pains he has taken may be, in other things, of very good use.

Last of all, That which I here assert concerning the independence of the diocese of Italy is so clear, that after a hundred treatises of the learned of the Church of Rome, who have maintained, that by the suburbicary Churches (whereof mention is made in the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice) all the western Churches were to be understood; M. Dupin, Doctor of the Sorbonne, has laid down the cudgels; confessing that the diocese of the Pope consisted only of the ten provinces about Rome, and that Italy, composed of seven provinces, was not in the least subject to it.

To conclude, Christianus Lupus owns, with all his reasons, that the diocese of Milan, in the midst of the ninth century, pretended to be independent, as we find it in his notes upon the Council of Pavia, under Leo IX. He very expressly observes, that this diocese did not own the laws which the Popes published in their councils, as pretending not to depend upon their regulations.

CHAPTER 14

Concerning the separation of the Churches of the diocese of Italy from the Church of Rome, and of the faith of the Patarines.

What I have already related concerning the independence of the diocese of Italy on the Pope, was a thing very displeasing and troublesome to the Church of Rome. She could not, without regret, see a diocese so near to her preserve its liberty, whilst a great number of other dioceses, at a farther distance, had quitted their rights, and acknowledged her jurisdiction. Nicolas II. having undertaken this business, made choice of Petrus Damianus, and Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, to be his Legates, making the difference which was risen between the people and the Clergy, upon occasion of two pretended heresies, that of the Simoniacs, and that of the Nicolaitans, who did not believe themselves bound to observe celibacy by a mere human authority. They began also to question the ordinations that had been made by order of the Emperors and other princes, as if it were no better than pure simony to get into the Church by this means. Moreover, there was also a kind of tax imposed upon those who were newly ordained, for the use of the Bishops and Archbishops, and without paying which there was scarcely any ordination to be had.

Petrus Damianus himself tells us, that upon his arrival at Milan, the Clergy stirred up the people to express their discontent against the design of this legation: *Non debere Ambrosianam Ecclesiam Romanis legibus subjacere, nullumque judicandi vet disponendi jus Romano Pontifici in illa sede competere. Nimis indignum ut quæ sub progenitoribus nostris SEMPER extitit libera, ad nostræ confusionis opprobrium, nunc alteri, quod absit, Ecclesie sit subjecta*: "That the Ambrosian Church ought not to be subjected to the laws of Rome; and that the Pope of Rome had no right at all of judging or disposing any thing there. It was a shame, said they, that she who has been ALWAYS free in the time of our forefathers, should now, to our great reproach and confusion, be forced to truckle, which God forbid, under another Church."

The people got together at the ringing of the bells, and went to the palace of the Archbishop, and put Cardinal Peter in danger of his life, as his friends told him. They express their indignation, because in the Synod of the Priests of that metro-polls he had had the boldness to sit above the Archbishop.

What does this wise Legate in this encounter? He gets up into the pulpit, and preacheth to them concerning the dignity of the Roman Church; that the prerogatives of other sees had been granted them by the Emperors, but that she only was beholden for her primacy to Jesus Christ; that those who refused to render obedience to her, did thereby make themselves heretics. In the sequel of his sermon he impudently asserts three palpable falsities: the one, that Nazarius and Celsus had been sent by St. Peter from Rome to Milan; the other, that St. Paul had sent thither St. Protasius and St. Gervasius; and the third, that St. Ambrose had recourse to the authority of Syricius, to purge his diocese from the heresy of the Nicolaitans, which began to spread itself there. These are the arguments he makes use of, and adds a passage out of a book, *De Sacerdotali Dignitate*, falsely attributed to St. Ambrose; wherein the author makes profession of his following the Church of Rome in all things, as his mistress.

It is pleasant to see this impostor congratulating himself, that he had asserted the prerogative of the Church of Rome to so good a purpose. This so very evangelical sermon smoothed all the rubs he met with at first. He examines the Clergy, and finds almost all of them guilty of simony. What is to be done in this case? There is no way left but a dispensation; and this way he takes: he makes the Archbishop and his Clergy to promise, never for the time to come to exact any thing, either directly or indirectly, of those whom he ordained; he chargeth him to anathematize the heresy of the Nicolaitans; he makes him promise, upon the Gospel, to exterminate them to the utmost of his power; he imposeth penance upon him and all his Clergy, and afterwards restores to them the ornaments of their orders, in the midst of mass, confirming them in the same, after he had made them swear to receive the seven General Councils, the last of which was the second of Nice, concerning the worshipping of images, which, it appears, that diocese had before rejected, as well as France, Germany, and Spain, at the Council of Francfort, in the year 794: nor can any body read,

without being ashamed, the pleasant penances he imposed on them, and the means he put into their hands of buying them off; it being one of the ways the Church of Rome had found out to make sins cheap.

However, this business did not go off so successfully as Petrus Damianus did expect: for soon after his departure, the Archbishop Wido, and his Clergy, became sensible of the false step they had made: Wido, supported by the nobility, called a council, and therein confirmed the right that Priests had to marry. The story is told by Bonizo, Bishop of Sutrium, in his Chronicle of the Popes, which is in the Emperor's library at Vienna, as Lambecius tells us, lib. 2. Comment. *Bibliothecae Vindobonensis*, p. 790. *Et de Stephano Godefredi, regis germano, et qualiter ejus temporibus Patarea apud Mediolanum exorta est, et de Nicolao Papa*; "And concerning Stephen Godfrey the king's brother, and how in his time the Patarea began at Milan, and concerning Pope Nicolas." Whence Mr. Ducange has very well concluded that Patarea, in the sense of this Bishop, signifies the pretended heresy of the Patarines.

The account which Sigonius gives us of this matter is this: *Cum multae aliae Ecclesiae nova de Simoniacorum atque Nicolaitarum haerisi decreta repudiarunt, tum maxime Mediolanensis, ut quae jampridem, Romanae Ecclesiae autoritate relicta, praeceptis ejus haudquaquam obtemperaret, et tamen siqua alia retro hujusmodi veneno infecta esset: hanc rem cum per se gravem, tum Mediolanensium Clericorum nomine turpem esse Arialdus, ex Alciata, ut fertur, familia, Clericus decumanus, ratus, Landulfo Cottae, populi Praefecto, auctor fuit ut eam palam oppugnandam aggrederetur. Id vero cum facere, secundis populi auribus animisque, coepisset, Wido, Archiepiscopus, contrariam parte suscepit, favore maxime nobilitatis innixus. Itaque res eo usque infamiae mutuis altercationibus jurgiisque deducta fuit, ut sacerdotes qui uxores haberent prae pudore separatim a caeteris rem divinam facere cogerentur in loco qui Patria dictur, unde vulgo a pueris Patarini ad contumeliam dicebantur.*

"Whereas many other Churches rejected the new decrees made against the heresy of Simoniacs and Nicolaitans, yet none more than the Church of Milan, who now for some time having renounced the authority of the Church of Rome, was no longer obedient to its precepts and yet was rather more infected with the poison of these heresies than any other: therefore one Arialdus, as was said, of the family of the Alciati, and one of the chief Clerks, conceiving this a matter as well heinous in itself as reproachful to the repute of the Clergy of Milan, he persuades Landulfus Cotta, the Prefect of the people, openly and with force to oppose himself against the same: which when he had undertaken, upon the people's appearing in favor of his design, Wido the Archbishop takes upon him the defense of the contrary party, relying chiefly upon the favor of the nobility so that this matter was carried to that infamous excess by their quarrels and wranglings, that the Priests who had wives were forced for shame to say mass separate from others, in a place called Patria, [or rather Pataria,] whence the boys, by way of reproach, afterwards gave them the name of Patarines."

Which is a very distinct account of the original of the name of Patarines. I shall in the sequel observe, first, That they have given this nickname of Patarines to the Waldenses, because the Waldenses were those Subalpini in Peter Damian, who at the same time maintained the same doctrines in the archbishopric of Turin. Secondly, that the Waldenses have always constantly maintained, that the Church could not deprive Ministers of the liberty of marrying, forasmuch as God had never deprived them of it, neither in the Old nor New Testament. What we are to observe here is, that these Patarines, being separated from the Church of Rome, were for the most part of the same opinions that were afterwards asserted by the Waldenses; which has been the reason why the Patarines and Waldenses have been taken for one and the same sort of heretics.

This we may know several ways:

First, Because since the Romans drove these out of their communion, which happened in the year 1059, it is natural to conceive, that those Patarines had raked together with care all the articles that might any way justify their separation.

Secondly, Because the disputes of Leo IX. with Michael Cerularius, Bishop of Constantinople, gave way to the strengthening of that separation; that dispute having given occasion to examine several articles which the Church of Rome proposed as necessary, which the Greeks rejected with an high hand.

Thirdly, Because we find that the Church of Milan, and those of that diocese, had now for some time testified a great aversion for the idolatry of Rome, and by rejecting the submission to the Church of Rome, procured by Petrus Damianus, they rejected also the second Council of Nice, as favoring idolatry, according to the definition of their ancestors at Francfort.

Fourthly, Because it appears by the book of Lanfranc against Berengarius, that some schismatics maintained his opinion, for so he expresseth himself in the account he gives us of the condemnation of Berengarius, in the Council of Rome. This probably would pass for no more than a conjecture, if the thing were not formally avowed by Matthew of Westminster, who saith upon the year, 1087, that Berengarius of Tours, being fallen into heresy, had already almost corrupted all the French, Italians, and English. When he speaks of a corruption in these dioceses about this matter, it is evident, that he means that they treated the Popes as innovators and Psephasians, and that they kept to the primitive faith of the Church, which the Popes had endeavored to condemn by their definitions.

Fifthly, Because it appears, that the Berengarians, who were of the same stamp with the Patarines, did discourse much at the same rate as the Waldenses did afterwards: this is evident from Lanfranc, where he tells us, that they accused the Church to have erred, by reason of ignorance, and that the Church remained in their party alone, and they with Berengarius called the Church of Rome, The congregation of the wicked, and the seat of Satan.

Sixthly, Because we find the Berengarians exposed to the same calumnies which were afterward imputed to the Patarines and Waldenses. This is evident from the discourse of Guimondus, Bishop of Aversa, lib. 1. contra Bereng. where he accuseth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful marriages, and the baptism of infants.

Seventhly, Because it appears from what is left us of the writings of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutrium, who took pen in hand in defense of the Pope's pretensions over this diocese, that his aim was to assert the self-same Roman doctrines, which in process of time we find constantly opposed by the Waldenses in that diocese. See here one of his notes, taken out of his Paradise of St. Austin, *De Baptismi sacramento, et de corporis et sanguinis Domini Eucharistia scrutare viriliter*.

In his eighth Abridgment he treats about, *Quid sit infernus, et utrum in inferno mali tantum, an etiam boni mansuri sint, et an corpora possint esse in ustione ignis perpetua, et quibus sacrificium prout post mortem, et qualiter mortui in seculis viventibus appareant, et de oblatione vel eleemosyna pro defunctis, et quod Adam morte Dominica ab inferno sit liberatus*. "What hell is, and whether the wicked only, or the good also, are to remain there: whether bodies can continue in everlasting burnings; and to whom the sacrifice of the mass is available after death; and how the dead may appear to the living in their dreams; and about offerings; and alms for the dead; and that Adam was delivered out of hell by the death of our Lord."

An understanding reader will easily judge, that these kind of questions are such as could not be discussed, without entering into those controversies that at this day we have with the Church of Rome.

This Bonizo was killed by those of Placenza, in the year 1089, as he was defending the cause of the Popes of Rome against the Emperors, whom he cruelly abused in his writings. He has given us an account in writing of the first rise of Pataria at Milan, under Pope Stephen II.

Two things more may be added to what I have already observed: the first is, that it is apparent, that though the Abbot Gezo had endeavored to confirm his Monks in the opinions of Paschasius, by copying almost his whole book, to make it more common in Italy, yet notwithstanding, that of John Scot continued still in being, and was the shield which Berengarius and his party made use of, to oppose the opinions of Paschasius. He was not condemned till the year 1059, in the Council of Vercell, under Leo IX. and the Italians almost immediately thereupon separated themselves from the communion of the Pope of Rome.

The second is, that there was such a great number of these Berengarians, who did not hold their doctrine from Berengarius, but from John Scot and others, that this became the subject of a great contest: this is evident from the life of the Abbot Wolfelmus. The same is likewise hinted to us by Sigebert, ad an. 1081,

in the edition of Miraeus, in the year 1608. Istis diebus Francia turbabatur per Berengarium Turonensem, qui asserebat Eucharistiam, quam sumlinus in altari, non esse revera corpus et sanguinem Christi: unde contra eum et pro eo multum a multis verbis et scriptis disputatum est. "In those days there were disturbances in France, by means of Berengarius of Tours, who maintained that the Eucharist which we receive on the altar is not the true body and blood of Christ: which occasioned great disputes both for and against him, as well by writing books as by public disputations."

We may gather the same truth we here set down from the compendious account we find in the Councils, in the place of the acts of the Council of Rome in the year 1079, under Gregory VII. against Berengarius. This account, which we find likewise in the *Chronicle of Verdun*, written by Hugo, Abbot of Flavigny, contains these express words; *Omnibus igitur in ecclesia Servatoris congregatis, habitus est sermo de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis haec, nonnullis illa [aprius] sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panera et vinum per sacrae orationis verba, et sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicurn de Virgine naturn, quod et in cruce pependit, et in sanguine, qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea, asserebat, [atque autoritatibus orthodoxorum Patrum, tam Græcorum, quam Latinorum defendebat.] Quidam vero caecitate nimia et longa perculsi figura tantum substantiale illud corpus in dextera Patris sedens esse, seque et alios decipientes, quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere, rerum ubi coepit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventura jherit in c synodo, defecit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti ignis emolu menta apalearum consumens, et fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans, noctis caliginem vettit in lucem.*

"All of them therefore being met together in St. Savior's church, they discoursed the matter about the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, many of them being of one, some [at first] of another opinion. For the greatest part of them maintained that the bread, and wine, by means of the sacred words and the Priest's consecration, through an invisible operation of the Spirit, were changed substantially into the body of our Lord, born of the Virgin, and which hung on the cross; and into the blood which gushed from his side when pierced with the soldier's spear. If and fully confirmed the same with the authorities of orthodox Greek and Latin Fathers. But some being smitten with an over great and long continued blindness, endeavored to prove, by sophistical cavillation, that it was figuratively only, a the substantial body sitting at the right hand of the Father, deceiving themselves and others. But when the matter began to be handled even before they had met the third day in council together, this party ceased any longer to oppose the truth; the fire of the Holy Ghost consuming these chaffy emoluments, and by his brightness dispersing the false light and darkening it, changed the darkness of the night into light."

This is the account of what passed in the council, and is found in the MS. of the councils which I have consulted; though they who have published the councils have changed it at their pleasure. But whatever pains they may have taken herein, it appears,

1. That Berengarius was not the author of that opinion in Italy, the greatest part of whose Bishops were summoned to that council by Gregory VII.
2. That this council was at first much divided, and that this division continued two days, and was not ended till the third day.
3. That the words, of a long blindness, which the author uses, cannot be spoken with reference to the disciples of Berengarius, but must refer to those who maintained the same doctrine which he did, from the time wherein this question, having been first started by Paschasius Radbertus, had occasioned that division; whereof the book of John Scot, which was burnt at Veteil, was an authentic testimony.

But I believe I have sufficiently made out in the foregoing chapters, that the diocese of Italy did always enjoy a light of doctrine of competent purity; as likewise, that the purity of divine worship ever continued amongst them, notwithstanding they had a little sprinkling of that ignorance and spirit of superstition, which had overflowed the Romish Church, and the greatest part of the western Churches. We had also a particular information, in what manner Italy separated itself from the Church of Rome, when she undertook to invade her rights, and to impose upon her her own errors and superstitions. We have seen that a party as

well of the superior as inferior Clergy, and the sounder part of the people, formed a distinct body, to secure themselves from that corruption.

This separation of the Clergy of Milan from the party of Landulphus Cotta, and of Arialodus, Deacon of Milan, who favored the interests and pretensions of the Pope, and the separation of those Subalpini in the bishopric of Turin, deserves, as we see, an extraordinary consideration. And forasmuch as this separation happened at the same time that the Council of Vercell condemned Berengarius and Johannes Scotus, we may easily conceive that the Clergy of Milan, and those Clergymen under the Alps, had no great esteem for that Papal condemnation: and the interest of Wido being embraced by many of the Bishops of his diocese, we cannot but conclude, that they had as little regard for that council, as they had for all the rest, that was derived from an authority, whose design was to invade these rights, as well as those of all the Bishops of the west. To show to what excess this division was carried, it is not necessary to set down here the bloody death of the Deacon Arialodus, which Andrew the Monk has described in a very tragical manner, as we find it in Baronius, upon the year 1066, thereby to expose Wido, and make him odious. It is evident, that what that Monk wrote is composed in such a legendary manner, that it renders all his relation suspicious; though if it were true indeed, yet could it scarcely more defame Wido, than so many Popes, who have destroyed their opposers, by the way of arms, that being the custom of these barbarous ages.

But we are to make our observation upon the endeavors which the Popes have used ever since this separation, to reconcile to themselves this part of the Clergy of Milan and Italy, who had separated themselves from the communion of the Church of Rome. Alexander II. in the year 1067, sent two Legates to Milan, who confirming what Petrus Damjanus, Cardinal of Ostia, had done, passed the same into orders and regulations that were to be strictly observed, as being pronounced in the name of God, St. Peter, and St. Ambrose, under pain of the same anathemas to the impenitent as were incurred by Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, and by Judas, Pilate, and Caiaphas, which are the very words of their order. But we find by the Epistles of Gregory VII. to the Lombards, that the Clergy of Milan only laughed at these regulations, having chosen Godfrey for their Bishop. And the said Gregory seems on this account to look upon them as the great enemies of the Christian religion, and that he did not think himself secure amongst them in the year 1077, above all; because they took part with Henry IV. against Gregory, whom they looked upon as justly deposed. We find the same Gregory endeavoring to strengthen his party against the Bishops of Lombardy, in opposing to them the authority of the Countess Beatrix, and her daughter Mathilda, who called those Bishops the forerunners of Antichrist. He endeavours to draw away the Bishop of Pavia from taking part with those of Milan. He immediately excommunicated Godfrey, Bishop of Milan, and successor of Wido, and orders the said excommunication to be published throughout the whole earth. He engages the Emperor Henry IV. to abandon the cause of those of Milan and Lombardy, who were called Simoniacs, only because they were willing to maintain the Emperor's rights, in reference to investitures, against the enterprises of some Popes that were before him.

The following year he summons the Suffragans of the bishopric of Milan, and the Abbots of that diocese, to come up to Rome, and to be present at the council.

In short, we meet with nothing in the sequel but reiterated endeavours to destroy the party of Italy that opposed them.

Our business now should be to show, that this body or party has continued ever since until the Reformation, under the name of Patarines, and afterwards of Waldenses. But before we come to this, we are bound to prevent the slanders, which the malice of the Romish party has raised against these separators. They have accused them to be an assembly of Cathari, that is, a sect of Manichees. This is the notion the authors of the eleventh and following centuries give us of them. Gitaldus Cambrensis, who wrote in the year 1200, accuseth the Patarians and Cathari with rejecting the carnal presence. Dist. 1. cap. 2. Gemma Ecclesiastes MS. Lambethani. Vincentius Belluacensis Specul. History 30. cap. 7. attributes several heresies to these Milanese.

CHAPTER 15

Concerning the belief of the Manichees, of their rise in Italy, their growth and their establishment

I conceive that the account I have given of the state of the Church of Italy is sufficient to make out, that as they enjoyed a sound knowledge in that diocese, so withal there was a great disposition amongst them, as well as in other western parts, to embrace the grossest of errors. Christians and Priests that are become Anthropomorphites, and who know nothing of religion but what they have learnt from images, which were justly called the books of the ignorant, have a great inclination to suffer themselves to be imposed upon by impostures. Of this we have a double proof. It was especially in the tenth century that the opinion of Paschasius attained strength and authority; an opinion, which we may well look upon as the most extravagant folly that ever any man dreamed of whilst awake. It was at the end of the same century, and the beginning of the next, that Manicheism, the most wild heresy the Devil could ever suggest, found many followers in Italy and Aquitaine, which were inhabited by the Waldenses and Albigenses. And forasmuch as in the sequel it will prove of great use to know this matter of fact, for the justification of the Waldenses and Albigenses, and those who, before they ever got these names, did in both these dioceses defend the interests of truth, by distinguishing them from those who adopted the sentiments of the Manichees, we can by no means pass it by here.

Bishop Usher indeed has already sufficiently done this, in his Treatise of the succession of the Protestant Churches, where he relates the arrival of the Manicheans into the west. But because probably the Bishop of Meaux had never seen this book, he was pleased to look upon the distinction which the Protestants make of the Albigenses and Waldenses, from the Manichees, as an evasion of some late Ministers; it lies upon us, to prove it to that degree of evidence, as that no doubt or difficulty may remain in the case.

I know well enough that this would seem not necessary with reference to the Waldenses, whom the Bishop of Meaux only terms schismatics: but though the Bishop be of this opinion, yet there may be others found of his communion, as there have been many before him, who will be little swayed by his authority; and therefore the matter is well worth our consideration.

In the first place I shall lay down the substance of their belief.

Secondly, I shall show that about the year of our Savior 1000, some of these Manichees began to spread in the west. And shall,

Thirdly, take notice in what particular places they abounded. In pursuing this matter on further, I shall make it evidently appear, that the party of the Church of Rome have made great use of the name of these heretics, to persecute those who set themselves against the errors and superstitions of that Church, though indeed they had nothing in common with the Manichees.

1. Then the Manichees held, that there were two principles opposite to each other, and equally eternal, the one good, and the other evil; and that consequently there were two natures, the one of that which was good, the other of that which was evil.
2. They looked upon matter as the effect of the evil God, and took the flesh to be wholly evil; and therefore they abhorred the begetting of children, and hindered it to the utmost of their power, by condemning marriage.
3. They rejected the Old Testament, maintaining, that he who spake to Moses was the Prince of darkness.

4. They maintained, that the creation of man was performed by the same author, and that there were two souls in every man, the one good, and the other bad; the one proceeding from God, and the other from the Prince of darkness. Thus it was they understood the conflict between the flesh and the spirit, whereof St. Paul speaks.

5. They denied free will, because otherwise God would be the author of sin.

6. They maintained, that the New Testament had been falsified, and under this pretense they admitted only of so much of it as pleased them.

7. They denied that Jesus Christ had any true flesh, maintaining, that he had only the figure and appearance of it, to delude the eyes. They denied his death and resurrection, and fasted on Sundays, as in opposition and contradiction to our Savior's resurrection.

8. They asserted, that he was not come to save the bodies, but only the souls of men; and they absolutely denied the resurrection of the body.

9. They believed, that Jesus Christ was in the sun and the moon, and the Holy Ghost throughout the whole air. When they worshipped, they turned themselves towards the sun, and worshipped the sun and moon, as containing Jesus Christ.

10. They rejected Baptism, as unnecessary to salvation.

11. As for the Eucharist, they asserted, according to the account St. Augustin gives us of them, that the Holy Ghost did beget Jesus Christ of the earth, subject to suffering, who was, as it were, bound in the ears of corn, and in the vine, but who by the digestion of the stomach was set loose and at liberty; yet they maintained withal, that wine was the gall of the Prince of darkness, and therefore rejected the use of wine in the Communion.

St. Augustin ascribes to these heretics a continual contradiction in their opinions; and above all, he sets forth their Eucharist as a thing so abominable, as the very notion of it is sufficient to strike one with horror, notwithstanding that they boasted themselves of keeping their mouths pure from any blasphemy against God, of never eating any flesh, or drinking wine; of having their hands clean from murder, and their bosoms pure and chaste, because their elect gloried in their observing perpetual chastity, and rejecting the use of marriage.

As for his attributing to them, that they had an aversion for the relics of the saints, this seems to be a consequence of their opinions concerning the original of the body, which they looked upon as proceeding from the evil principle.

12. They condemned husbandry, attributing to trees and plants a sensitive life.

13. They maintained, that war was altogether unlawful.

These were their principal heresies. As for the discipline of their sect, it consisted of two orders, viz. the elect and auditors.

The hearers had leave to marry, if they pleased; to eat flesh, and till the ground; all which was forbidden to the elect.

The elect had the power of the imposing of hands on their hearers, who kneeled before them, in order to receive the said imposition.

There were twelve principal elect, who were called the masters, who had a thirteenth that was over them.

They had seventy-two Bishops, who were created by those masters we have just now mentioned, and the Bishops ordained the Priests and Deacons. This is the account St. Augustin gives us of their hierarchy. Petrus Diaconus of Sicily, who wrote against them about the year 870, makes it appear that he was acquainted with them, as having been with them at Tibrica in Armenia, and conferred with them. He dedicates his book to the Archbishop of Bulgaria, advertising him, that the Paulitiani or Manichees of Tibrica were resolved to send some of their people into Bulgaria, to seduce those who had newly embraced the Christian religion in that kingdom. This was that which put him upon writing this treatise, to forearm that Prelate against their enterprises.

He accuseth them of dissembling their errors, and of making such a profession of faith, as was sufficiently orthodox, though indeed, and at the bottom, they opposed it; and makes a very exact description of them and their errors.

He tells us, that they in appearance admit of the whole Gospel, and all the Epistles of St. Paul; that they confess the Trinity and Incarnation, but that they elude these their confessions by equivocations, till they have got an entrance into the spirit of those who listen to them, and judge them susceptible of their impieties, which then they freely discover to them. He compriseth their opinions in six articles:

I. That there is a good God and an evil God; the first, the Creator of the world to come; and the second, the Creator of the world.

II. That they do not own the Virgin Mary to have been the mother of Jesus Christ, whose body, according to them, was brought down from heaven.

III. That they reject the Eucharist, denying that Jesus Christ ever consecrated the symbols of bread and wine; but they explain those words in a mystical sense, with reference to his actions.

IV. That they deny the cross of Jesus Christ.

V. That they reject the Old Testament, receiving nothing besides the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, to which they add the Epistles of one Sergius, one of the heads of their sect.

VI. That they removed Priests from the ministry of the Church. In a word, he sets forth their heresies much according to the account we find of them in St. Cyril, Bishop of Hierusalem, Cateches. 6. out of whom he has transcribed many long passages.

I will not trouble myself at present to set down the account which later authors have given of the Manichees. Emericus, in his *Directory of the Inquisitors*, has made an abridgment of the opinions of those amongst them, which he pretends appeared in Italy, under the popedom of Innocent the Third, who had for their master a person called Manes, who lived then in the diocese of Milan. This good inquisitor, as we see by this, was not over-well acquainted with Church history. However, he takes notice of some articles, which it may be worth while to observe here. Of the fourteen articles he ascribes to them, these following may serve to clear some things we have already set down concerning the belief and conduct of the Manichees.

The second article is, That they supposed two sorts of Churches, the one kind and meek, which they said was their sect, and the Church of Jesus Christ; the other malicious, which they said was the Church of Rome, and very impudently called her a Mother of Fornications, the great Babylon, a Whore, the Devil's Cathedral, and the Synagogue of Satan.

The third article is, That they condemned all the degrees, orders, and ordinations of the Holy Church, as well as her ordinances, which they corrupted; they called all those heretics that were of her communion, and publicly taught that they could not be saved in the communion of Rome.

The fourth article is, That all the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, which were instituted by our Savior Jesus Christ, viz. the Eucharist, Baptism, which is celebrated with material water, Confirmation, Orders, Extreme Unction, Penance, and Matrimony between man and wife, were all of them vain and frivolous; and that like apes they reigned certain other outward ceremonies, which had some resemblance with them.

The fifth article is, That, instead of holy Baptism, they fancied another spiritual Baptism, which they called the comfort of the Holy Ghost; that is to say, when they received any person, whether sick or in health, into their sect, or ordained them by imposition of hands, according to their execrable ceremonies.

The sixth article is, That instead of consecrated bread, or the Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, they supposed another sort of bread, which they called Blessed Bread, or the Bread of Holy Prayer, which they took in their hands, at the beginning of their meals, blessing it, breaking and distributing it to those that were present, of their belief, according to their ordinary custom.

The seventh article is, That, instead of the sacrament of Penance, they said, that the true exercise of penance did consist in following their orders, and being of their sect: and maintained, that all those who, being sick or in health, did keep the laws of their sect, and their ordinances, did thereby obtain the pardon of their sins, without any other satisfaction; yea, even without making restitution of those things which they had unjustly got; affirming, moreover, that herein they had the same power that St. Peter and St. Paul, with the other Apostles of our Savior Jesus Christ, had. They said also, that the confession of sins that is made to Priests of the Romish communion is not of any use to salvation; and that neither the Pope, nor any other person of that communion, had the power of forgiving sins.

The eighth article is, That, instead of the carnal sacrament of marriage between man and wife, they supposed that there was another spiritual marriage between God and the soul of man; when being perfect heretics, or in the abundance of consolations, they received any one into their sect, and incorporated them into their order.

The ninth article is, That they denied the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in the womb of the most holy Virgin. They asserted, that he did not take upon him a true human body, nor the true flesh of man, as other men take it from human nature; that he never truly suffered or died on the tree of the cross; that he never truly rose again, nor ascended into heaven with a body of human flesh; but that all these things were only done in appearance.

The tenth article is, That the Blessed Virgin Mary was not the mother of our Savior Jesus Christ: they deny also that she was a carnal woman, but maintained, that their sect was that Mary, that Virgin, the true penance; that she was chaste, and a virgin who begat children to God, as often as any were received into their order and sect.

The eleventh article is, That they denied the resurrection of our bodies, and, instead thereof, supposed certain spiritual bodies, or a kind of inward men, in which they said the future resurrection was to be celebrated. The twelfth article is, They said and believed that all those spirits that departed out of human bodies went into the bodies of beasts and birds, if they were not received into their sect, or incorporated into their order, by the imposition of their hands, according to the customary form of their ceremonies; that all these souls passed continually from one body into another; for which reason they did not eat the flesh of any living creature, nor ever killed any birds.

The thirteenth article is, That they held, that man ought never to eat flesh, no, not so much as touch it, nor cheese, nor eggs, nor any thing proceeding from flesh by way of generation or carnal conjunction: which they also observed.

These are the heresies of the Manichees, which Emericus sets down after another manner than they are described by Archclaus, St. Cyril, St. Epiphanius, St. Augustin, Theodoretus, and Petrus Diaconus of Sicily. It is visible that some part of these heresies were only chimeras, occasioned by some allegorical expressions of those who then preached against the Romish Church, but, however, most maliciously and falsely attributed to the Waldenses and Albigenses.

Notwithstanding this Emericus's mistake in the account he gives us of the original of this sect, sure it is, that it owes its birth to one called Scythianus, who probably had been familiar with the Marcionites. He left his doctrine to one named Terebinthus; after whose death it came into the hands of Manes, who mixed something of the Gospel with it, and who gave the name to his followers.

This sect spread itself in Africa, Asia, Spain, and Italy; and notwithstanding that in process of time the Christian Emperors published several laws for their extirpation, yet we find that there still continued a considerable body of them in the east. Theophanes tells us, that there were some of this sect amongst the Syrians and Armenians in the eighth century, whom the Emperor Constantine transported into Thrace from Theodosiopolis and Melitene, who spread abroad the heresies of the Paulicians, (or Publicani,) for so Anastasius calls them.

We find in the ninth century, an. 811, that the Emperor Nicephorus favored the Manichees, called Paulieiani and Acingani, who lived in Phrygia and Lyeaonia. Michael Ranga being Emperor persecuted them, killed some, and banished the rest.

We find in the tenth century, that Theodorus, Bishop of Antioch, obliged the Emperor John Zimisces to banish the Manichees into the west, that had spread themselves throughout all the east, and had infected all places with their heresies; which he accordingly did, as we find it reported by Zo-Baras. We find, since that time, that they spread themselves from Bulgaria (being thence called Bulgari, and in the French tongue Boulgres) into Dalmatia, and from thence into the western provinces, where they were called Cattari, and thence by mistake Cathari or Catharini, the Germans calling them Kettters. And it is probable that from this school came those Manichees that appeared in Italy, as well as those that appeared at Orleans, in the year 1017, and afterwards in Languedoc. Vignier has published a fragment of an ancient author, who calls them Catharini, and who sets forth their settling of themselves in Lombardy, Tuscany, and in the Marchia; that about the year 1023 their first Bishop was called Marc, who derived his ordination from Bulgaria, who afterwards, at the solicitation of one Nicetas, Pope, come from Constantinople, he took orders of him, and entered into the order of Druncaria. Afterwards he represents the different parties and different opinions amongst them. We find also, that Raynerus, who in the thirteenth century gives us a description of their Churches, makes three sorts of Cathari in Lombardy; observing that those who had settled themselves at Tholouse were of the same opinion with those who called themselves Albanenses, or of Senzano in Lombardy.

Now, that we may make some use of this description of the Manichees and their errors, it will be needful to observe,

First, That since they began to punish the Manichees with death, it was very natural for those who had a mind to destroy those they called heretics, to charge them with their errors: so that we may here very easily be mistaken between the true Manichees and those to whom their errors were falsely imputed.

Secondly, That since they had represented to the people, that one of the characters of the Manichees was, to dissemble their errors, and exactly to conceal their abominations, they had a very good pretense to condemn those pretended heretics for half Manichees, who, according to the principles of the Manichees, concealed their true opinions, though they did so upon another ground, as the rigour of their persecutors.

Thirdly, That in those barbarous and cruel ages, **a small conformity of opinions with the Manichees was a sufficient ground to accuse them of Manicheism, who opposed any doctrines received by the Church of Rome. Thus would they have taken the Anabaptists for downright Manichees, because they condemned the baptism of infants.**

Fourthly, **And indeed we shall find the prejudices conceived on this account were so strong, that it has made them to be accused of Manicheism, whose opinions evidenced that their principles were directly opposite to those of the Manichees,** with as much ground as if we should accuse the Church of Rome of Manicheism, upon pretense of her forbidding the use of the cup with reference to the people, which formerly was a note of Manicheism, as we find it mentioned in the Decrees of the Popes, Leo and Gelasius.

They accused those of Manicheism, that denied the substantial conversion of the bread into the body of Jesus Christ. They called those Manichees, that would not worship the Virgin or the cross; as if, forsooth, they had denied that Jesus Christ took a true body in the womb of the Virgin, or that he had been truly crucified.

CHAPTER 16

Concerning the Cathari spoken of by Evervinus and St. Bernard, and their distinction from the Patarines

We are obliged to Mabillon for having communicated to us the letter of Evervinus, Praepositus of Steinfield, in the diocese of Cologne. It is evident, that he has described the same heretics whereof Egbertus, Monk of Schonaue, makes mention in his sermons. Only he distinguishes them into two orders, the one whereof he sets forth to us as Manichees; the others, whom he does not accuse of any thing like what they were charged with. He makes so great a distinction between them, that it is very strange the Bishop of Meaux should confound them as he does, as if they had been but one and the same body of men.

Now, since it is very probable, according to the judgment of Mabillon, that this letter of Evervinus to St. Bernard furnished this famous Abbot with an occasion of handling those controversies, which he has touched upon in his sermons upon the Canticles, it will be worth the while to set down the said letter of Evervinus, as to its principal points; and the rather, because it serves to set forth the sincerity of Petrus Cluniacensis in the manner he has taken to treat those controversies, following therein very exactly the notions of Evervinus, and carefully distinguishing those two sorts of opinions he opposeth; whereas St. Bernard seems to have much more confounded them.

Now what Evervinus writes to St. Bernard, a little before the year 1140, is this:

"There have been lately some heretics discovered: amongst us, near Cologne, whereof some with satisfaction returned again to the Church: two of these, viz. one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the Clergy and laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which they might bring along with them men skillful in their belief, promising to return to the Church, provided they should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, **they were seized by the people, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the fire, and burnt; and (what is most wonderful) they entered to the stake, and bare the torment of the fire, not only with patience, but with joy and gladness.** In this case, O holy Father, were I present with you, I should be glad to have your answer, how these members of the Devil could with such courage and constancy persist in their heresy, as is scarcely to be found in the most religious in the faith of Christ.

"Their heresy is this: They say that the Church is only amongst them, because they alone follow the steps of Christ, and continue in the imitation of the true apostolic life, not seeking the things of this world, possessing neither house, lands, nor any thing in propriety, according as Christ did, who neither possessed any himself, nor gave leave to his disciples to possess any thing. Whereas ye (say they to us) join house to house, and field to field, seeking the things of this world; so that even they also, who are looked upon as most perfect amongst you, such as are your Monks and Regular Canons, though they do not possess these things as proper, but as common, yet do they possess all these things. And of themselves they say, We the poor of Christ, who have no certain abode, fleeing from one city to another, like sheep in the midst of wolves, do endure persecution with the Apostles and Martyrs: notwithstanding that we lead an holy and strict life in fasting and abstinence, persevering day and night in prayers and labors, and seeking only from thence what is necessary to support our lives, we maintain ourselves thereby because we are not of the world. But as for you lovers of the world, ye have peace with the world, because ye are of the world. False Apostles, who adulterate the word of Christ, seeking their own, have misled you and your forefathers; whereas we and our fathers, being born Apostles, have continued in the grace of Christ, and, shall continue so to the end of the world. To distinguish us from one another, Christ saith, By their fruits ye shall know them: our fruits are the footsteps of Christ. In their diet they forbid all manner of milk, and whatsoever is made of it, and all that is procreated by copulation. This is that which they oppose to us concerning their

conversation. As to the Sacraments, they conceal themselves; yet did they openly confess to us, that daily at their tables, when they take their meals, they, according to the form of Christ and his Apostles, do consecrate their meat and drink into the body and blood of Christ, by the Lord's Prayer, to nourish themselves therewith, as being the members and body of Christ. But as for us, they say we hold not the truth in the Sacraments, but only a kind of shadow, and tradition of men. They also openly confess, that besides water, they baptized also with fire and the Holy Ghost, and had been so baptized themselves; alleging to this purpose the testimony of St. John the Baptist baptizing with water, and saying concerning Christ, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire: and in another place, I indeed baptize you with water, but there stands one in the midst of you, whom you know not, who shall baptize you with another baptism besides that of water. And that this other baptism was to be performed by the imposition of hands, they endeavored to make out by the testimony of St. Luke, who, in the Acts of the Apostles, describing Paul's baptism, which he received from Ananias at the command of Christ, makes no mention of water, but only of the laying on of hands; and whatsoever else we find, whether in the Acts of the Apostles or in St. Paul's Epistles, they apply to this baptism; and they say, that every elect (for so they call all those that are baptized amongst them) hath power to baptize others whom they find worthy, and to consecrate the body and blood of Christ at their meals. For first, by their laying on of hands they receive some of their auditors into the number of believers, and then they have leave to be present at their prayers, until that, after having had sufficient trial of them, they make them elect. They condemn our baptism, condemn marriage; but the reason why, I could not get out of them, either because they durst not own it, or rather because they knew none."

We have here a very exact and circumstantiate description of a sect of Manichees, if we please to compare it with the account that has already been given concerning them. And though we find these persons somewhat different in their opinions from the Cathari, yet, notwithstanding that, they have put their name upon them, as if they also had been Manichees. But Evervinus goes on further in these words:

"There are also some other heretics in our country, who are altogether different from these, by whose mutual discord and contests they were both of them discovered to us. **These deny that the body of Christ is made on the altar**, because all the Priests of the Church are not consecrated. **For the apostolical dignity, say they, is corrupted**, by engaging itself in secular affairs, and the sitting in the chair of Peter; yet because it does not wage God's warfare as Peter did, it has deprived itself of the power of consecrating, which was so great in Peter; and what it has not itself, the Archbishops and Bishops, who live like men of the world, cannot receive from it, viz. the power of consecrating others: to this purpose alleging these words of Christ, The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's chair; what therefore they bid you do, that do. As if such as these had only the power of preaching and commanding, but nothing more. Thus they make void the Priesthood of the Church, and condemn the Sacraments besides Baptism only; and this only in those who are come to age, who, they say, are baptized by Christ himself, whosoever be the Minister of the Sacraments. They do not believe infant baptism; alleging that place of the Gospel, Whosoever shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved. All marriage they call fornication, besides that which is between two virgins, male and female; quoting for this the words of our Savior, wherewith he answers the Pharisees, What God hath joined let no man separate; as if God did only join such together, as he did our first parents: as likewise those words of our Savior, which he speaks to the Jews, in answer to what they objected to him about the bill of divorce, From the beginning it was not so; and the following words, whosoever marrieth her that is divorced, commits adultery; and that of the Apostle, Let marriage be honorable to all, and the bed undefiled.

"**They put no confidence in the intercession of the saints**; they maintain that fasting, and other afflictions which are undertaken for sin, are not necessary to the just, nor to sinners; **because at what time soever the sinner repents of his sin, they are all forgiven to him; and all other things observed in the Church, which have not been established by Christ himself or his Apostles, they call superstitions. They do not admit of any purgatory fire after death**; but that the souls, as soon as they depart out of the bodies, do enter into rest or punishment; proving it from that place of Solomon, Which way soever the tree falls, whether to the south or to the north, there it lies: by which means they make void all the prayers and oblations of believers for the deceased.

"We therefore desire you, holy Father, to employ your care and watchfulness against these manifold mischiefs, and that you would be pleased to direct your pen against these wild beasts of the reeds; not

thinking it sufficient to answer us, that the tower of David, to which we may take our refuge, is sufficiently fortified with bulwarks, that a thousand bucklers hang on the walls of it, all shields of mighty men. For we desire, Father, that for the sake of us simple ones, and that are slow of understanding, you would be pleased by your study to gather all these arms in one place, that they may be the more ready to be found, and more powerful to resist these monsters. I let you know also, that those of them who have returned to our Church, told us, that they had great numbers of their persuasion scattered almost every where and that amongst them were many of our Clergy and Monks. And as for those who were burnt, they, in the defense they made for themselves, told us, that this their heresy had been concealed from the time of the martyrs until these times; and that it had been preserved in Greece, and some other countries. These are those heretics who call themselves Apostles, having a Pope of their own; whereas the other despise our Pope, and yet own themselves to have no other besides him. These Apostles of Satan have amongst them continent women, (as they call them,) widows, virgins, their wives, some of which are amongst the number of their elect, others of their believers; as in imitation of the Apostles, who had power to lead about women with them. Farewell in the Lord."

This is the letter of Evervinus, whence St. Bernard took occasion to refute these heretics in his 65th and 66th sermons upon the Song of Solomon. And indeed we find that the beginning of his 65th sermon contains a manifest allusion to the beginning of this letter of Evervinus. St. Bernard chargeth them in that sermon, that though they believed the Gospel, yet did forbid swearing altogether; and that notwithstanding this prohibition, yet they suffered their disciples to forswear themselves, to preserve the secret of their religion, p. 759.

2. He supposeth that their endeavor to hide their religion was a sufficient token of its impurity with respect to manners.

3. He accuseth them for rejecting the authority of the Old Testament; though he seem to express himself doubtfully on that point, *ibid.* 1.

4. He accuseth them of rejecting St. Paul; though he confesseth that this was not the judgment of them all, but only of some of them: *K. Anforte nec Paulum recipitis? De quibusdam ita audiui; non enim inter vos omnes per omnia concordatis, etsi a nobis omnes dissentiat: "Probably you reject Paul also: for so I have heard of some of you; for neither do you all agree amongst yourselves, though you all differ from us."*

5. He accuseth them for falsely boasting themselves of their chastity, as having wives with whom they lived in the same house, without being married with them, *ibid.* M. and without being either their wives, daughters, sisters, or otherwise of kin to them. St. Bernard, who sets them forth as a sort of people who were unblameable in their carriage and behavior, yet triumphs over them in this point; accusing them of giving offense to their neighbour, p. 761.

That which is very singular in this refutation of St. Bernard is, 1. That at the end of his first sermon he gives a description of them from p. 762. B. in these terms: *File nempe hoc genus et rusticanum, ac sine literis, et prorsus irabile;* he relates their different opinions as not certainly known; and after that, he undertakes to refute them, as if they deserved to be refuted.

2. That he asserts they were divided; and yet owns that he knew nothing about them, but from the answers they had given to some Catholics, or what he had learnt from those who were entered again into the Church. In all his first sermon therefore he insists on these two points: the first is, that they concealed their opinions, which was contrary to the behavior of the Apostles. The other, that their dwelling with women not married was a proof of their impurity. The good Father, whilst he discoursed thus, did not consider the rigour of the persecution they were under; and he had forgot that Robertus of Arbrissel had practiced the like continence with women.

In his second sermon he lays down some part of their opinions; and this he does like a declamator; his first sermon having been spent in invectives against them.

1. He chargeth them with condemning marriage.

2. He sets them forth as idiots, and an ignorant sort of people, but withal dangerous, as introducing again the heresies condemned by St. Paul, 1 Timothy 4.

3. He sets upon their title of Apostolical, as pretending that they had no authors; and he only suspects them of Manicheism, though he seems to have freed them from that imputation before, when he says, *Quare cum illius sectae authorem neminem dabunt*: "Wherefore since they can produce no author of their sect."

4. He saith, that some amongst them allowed marriage only where both the parties were virgins.

5. He chargeth them with abstaining from meats: *Horrent lac, et quicquid ex eo conficitur; postremo, quicquid ex coitu generatur*: "They abhor milk, and all that is made of it; and last of all, whatsoever is generated by copulation." In which point he suspects them of Manicheism.

6. He accuseth them of consecrating the body and blood of Jesus Christ at their common tables: *Ad nutriendum se in corpus Christi et membra*, to feed themselves into the body of Christ and members. 7. He accuseth them of looking upon themselves as the only successors of the Apostles.

8. HE ACCUSETH THEM OF MOCKING AT INFANT BAPTISM, prayer for the dead, and the invocation of saints.

9. He accuseth them of detracting and slandering ecclesiastical Orders, of rejecting Church ordinances, contemning the Sacraments, and disobeying her commands, under pretense that the Popes, the Archbishops, the Bishops, and Priests were sinners incapable of administering or receiving the Sacraments.

10. Here he stops, as asserting that nobody knows all their opinions, and that there is no way of convincing them, because they will not admit the authorities which they do not understand.

11. He confesseth that they had been examined by water, and found guilty. *Quaesitum (N. B.) cum de quibus suspecti videbantur, omnia prorsus suo more negarent, examinati aquos iudicio, mendaces inventi sunt: cumque jam negare non possent, quippe deprehensi, aqua eos non recipiente*. "When as they, after their manner, denied all things whereof they were suspected, being examined by the judgment of water, they were found liars: and being no longer able to deny it, because they were found guilty, by the water not admitting of them, they confessed their crimes, offered themselves to defend them to the death, and were knocked on the head by the people;" which St. Bernard finds fault with, as desiring rather that the magistrate might have put them to death by law.

12. He removes the scandal which their constancy occasioned, they dying like true martyrs.

13. He pretends that the means of convincing them, is to oblige them to quit the women they have with them, or else to leave the Church.

14. But for all this he observes, that they were supported by Princes, Bishops, and others, *propter quetum*, for their interest sake, and who alleged it as reason, that they could not condemn persons that were neither convict, nor confess their crimes.

We may make these following reflections on what St. Bernard saith concerning them.

1. That he speaks of the same of whom Evervinus doth.

2. That he confounds them together, whereas Evervinus distinguishes them.

3. That the reason of their being reduced to dissemble their true opinions, was for fear of torments, and of being torn to pieces by the people.

4. That the judgment of water having been employed against them, they had very just cause of fear.

5. That their distinction is evident enough from what St. Bernard himself saith of them, and that he confounded them by malice or by mistake.

6. That their confessions did not satisfy the Princes, nor the Bishops themselves.

7. **That the Manicheism, which he objected to them all, was not a true imputation to all of them,** since it is true the Manichees drank not wine.

8. That at last St. Bernard reduceth all to this, that he would have them punish by excommunication, in case they did not renounce the company of the women they had with them.

Petrus Cluniacensis has handled five questions against the Petrobusians, which bear a great resemblance with the belief of the Cathari of Italy: but since the disciples of Peter de Bruis were seated in the country of the Albigenses, we should confound matters by treating of them here.

CHAPTER 17

A continuation of the History of the Cathari in Italy, as elsewhere, and their distinction from the Patarines

My design is not to abuse my reader's patience, by setting, down here all that I could observe relating to the history of the Cathari, from the writings of several authors of the twelfth and thirteenth century, as of Egbert, Abbot of Schonauge, Alanus of Lisle, Giraldus Cambrensis, and Bonacursius, who gives us an account of their opinions, and of their settlement in the dioceses of Cologne, Gallia Narbonensis, Flanders, and the diocese of Milan. Yet I cannot but represent to the reader, that the malice or imprudence of these authors makes them ordinarily to confound those whom Evervinus, in his forementioned Epistle to St. Bernard, had with more care and honesty distinguished, and that whilst they writ the history of the Cathari, they had an eye to the Patarines, who had spread their belief through all those places, and whom they designed to make odious, by confounding them with the Cathari, that is to say, with the new upstart Manichees.

Egbert, a Monk, and afterwards Abbot of Schonauge, tells us, that he had as often disputed with these heretics as any of them were discovered amongst the people, so that he seems to be a witness well informed in the case, though he owns that he had learned more of their opinions from those who had renounced them, that is, from those who by the force of torments, and threats of being burnt, had abandoned their belief. He sets them forth as men famous by their errors; "These are they who are commonly called Cathari a sort of people very pernicious to the Catholic faith, which like moths they corrupt and destroy."

And yet he adds, that they were divided into several sects, and maintained their opinions by the authority of Scripture.

"They are armed with the words of holy Scripture which any ways do seem to favor their opinions, and with these they know how to defend their errors, and to oppose the Catholic truth; though indeed they be altogether ignorant of the right understanding that is couched in those words, and which cannot be discovered without great judgment."

We may observe here, that this title of Egbert's book doth not answer to the account Trithemius gives us of it in his catalogue, who sets down only these two words, *adversum hereses*, lib. 1. *Prophetatum dudurn tempora; whereas the title of it contains a long description of these Manichean heresies: jid, ersus pestif eros fosdissimosque Catharorum (qui Manichosorum hwresim innovarunt) damnatos errores ac hereses, Egberti Presbyteri, primo Ecclesiae Collegiate Bunnensis, Coloniensis dioeceseos Canonici, demure vero professi monachi Schonauugiensis monasterii, utilissimi sermones, ex penetralibus Evangelicis, et aliarum divinarum Scripturarum atmario deprompti. Esc quibus proculdubio fructum plurimum metet diligens lector et candidus. Breve ex dugustino de Manicheis excerptum, per eundem Ecbertum.* Possibly Trithemius had no mind to trouble himself with quoting so prolix a title; but certain it is, that neither Reginald's Epistle, nor the first Sermon of Egbert, have the beginning which Trithemius ascribes to it: which may give us just cause of suspicion, that either the list they give us under Egbert's name is none of his; or, that some part of it has been suppressed, according to the laudable custom which is in vogue with the Roman party in their publishing of authors. Nor is it without reason they make use of this way, their zeal for the Romish faith frequently obliging them to make use of pious frauds, by hiding or disguising the true sentiments of those authors they publish. But not to insist upon this, he represents to us, first, the extent and spreading of the doctrine of the Cathari throughout several places, as well as their different names.

"They are increased to those multitudes throughout all countries, that the Church of God is in great danger of the poison they scatter every where against her; for their words spread like a cancer, and, like a flying leprosy, runs every way, infecting the precious members of Christ. These in our Germany we call *Catharini*, in Flanders they call them *Piphles*, and in French, *Tisserands*, from the art of weaving,

because a great many of them are of that occupation. And as our Lord has foretold concerning them, they say Christ is in the inward rooms; for they declare that the true faith and worship of Christ is no where to be found but in their meetings, which they keep in their cellars and weaving rooms and in such like dwellings under ground, they say, they lead the lives of Apostles."

Secondly, He sets forth to us their opinions, and the desire they have to multiply their disciples; in which regard we must own that he describes them as true Manichees, who absolutely forbade marriage, and all eating of flesh; who rejected baptism with water, and instead thereof substituted a false one, in Spiritu Sancto et igne, "with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" and who concerning the Eucharist entertained the notions of the Manichees, and who in particular maintained that souls were fallen angels.

But withal we are to observe, that **he attributes opinions to them that are very different from any thing of Manicheism**, and which Evervinus attributes to another sort of heretics, of whom he makes mention. *De animabus mortuorum, talem sententiamr habent, quod in ipsa hora exitus sui, vel transeunt ad aeternam beatitudinem, vel ad aeternam damnationem. Non enim recipiunt, quod credit universalis Ecclesia, viz. esse quasdam purgatorias paenas, in quibus animx quorundam electorum, ad ternpus examinantur pro peccatis suis, de quibus in hac vita per con-dignam satiJactionem ad plenum purgatx non sunt: propterea ergo arbitrantur superfluum et vanum esse pro mortuis eleemosynas dare, missas celebrare, et irridit pulsationes campanarum, quas facimus, quos tamen pia ratlone in ecclesias funt, ut videlicet vivi ad orandum pro mortuis commoneantur, et ad memoriam proprii mortis excitentur. Missas qux in ecclesiis celebrantur, omnino spernunt, et pro nihilo ducunt. Nam si forte cum populo, in quo habitant, ad audiendure missas, sive etiam ad perci: piendam Eucharistiam accedunt, omnino hoc simulatorie faciunt, ne indqdelitas eorum possit notari. Ordinem quippe sacerdotii in Romans Ecclesia, et cunctis Ecclesiis Catholicae fidei, omnino periisse dicunt, nec usquam nisi in secta eorum veros sacerdotes inveniri.*

"Concerning the souls of the dead, they hold this opinion; that at the very instant of their departure out of the body, they go to eternal bliss, or eternal damnation: for they receive not the belief of the universal Church, viz. that there are some purgatory punishments, wherewith the souls of some of the elect are tried, for some time for those sins from which they have not been purged by a plenary satisfaction in this life. **Wherefore also they account it superfluous and vain to give alms for the dead, and celebrate masses;** and they scoff at our ringing of bells, which yet for pious reasons are used in our churches, to give others warning that they may pray for the dead, and to put them in mind of their own death. **As for masses, they altogether despise them,** and look on them as nothing worth; for if ever they accompany the people they dwell with to hear Mass, or to receive the Sacrament, they do this only dissemblingly, that their infidelity might not be taken notice of; for they maintain that the sacerdotal order is altogether perished in the Church of Rome, and all other Catholic Churches, and that true priests are only to be found in their sect."

Thirdly, He sets forth to us the original of these Cathari, which he pretends they derive from the Manichees, notwithstanding that he himself observes, that they were not all of the same opinions. These are his words; *Multa tamen permixta habent doctrine magistri sui, quae inter hareses illius non inveniuntur. Divisi etiam sunt contra semetipsos, quia nonnulla quoe ob alifuibus eorum dicuntur, ab allis negantur:* "Yet have they also many things mingled with their Master's doctrine, which we do not find amongst his heresies. They are also divided amongst themselves; so what some of them I say again denied by others."

We may see from hence, whether our author herein deals with that candor as he ought to do, when, without distinguishing between the different sects whereof he treats, he endeavors to prove them all to be Manichees.

1. From the conformity of their discipline with that which authors tell us was amongst the Manichees.
2. From the conformity of their opinions.

3. From the account he gives us of some extracts out of St. Augustin's discourse on this subject, with design to draw a comparison between the opinions of these new Cathari and those of old.

It seems to me to be very evident, either that this author did out of malice confound these two parties, against whom he disputes, which was avoided by Evervinus; **or that he jumbled them together out of ignorance,** upon pretense, that there was something of conformity in their opinions, though they differed in their principles, on which they founded their opinions, the one drawing them as consequences from Manicheism, the other maintaining them upon other principles opposite to the Church of Rome. We ought to make this observation with respect to those authors, who in the twelfth century have made mention of the Cathari with this kind of confusion.

Ughellus tells us, in the *Life of Galdinus*, Archbishop of Milan, that after he had persecuted them, during the eight or nine years of his episcopacy, he died in the year 1173, by his over-vehement preaching against them. Ripamontius, in his *History of Milan*, gives us the sermon of Galdinus against the Cathari, whom he calls Manichees and Arians. But an indifferent judgment will be able to discover, that that piece is of Ripamontius's own forging, and consequently deserves no credit at all. D'Achery has published the writing of an author, who pretends to discover the doctrine of the Cathari, of which he had been surely informed by the conversion of one Bonacursus to the Roman faith, who had been one of their Bishops, and had abjured their doctrine. This author makes three sorts of heretics, the Cathari, the Passagii, and the Arnoldistae whose doctrines he refutes: but a wise reader will easily discern a great deal either of ignorance or malice in this author.

He accuseth some of these Cathari of maintaining doctrines that are plain Manicheism; but then he jumbles others with them that are pure Arianism, and others again which seem to have been defended by the Paterines. I shall pass by those doctrines that are wholly Manichean, as, that the Devil created the elements; that he made Adam; that the old Law was given by the Devil, etc., as also those that are Arian, as, that Jesus Christ is not equal with the Father. **It is evident, that amongst these he has mingled some which were maintained by the Paterines, who were enemies to the Romish idolatry:** as for example, that the Cathari maintained *erucem esse characterem bestice, quce in Apocalypsi esse legitur, et abominationera stantem in loco sancto. Beatum Sylvestrum dicunt Antichristum fuisse, de quo legitur in Epistolis, daelius perditionis est, qui extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus; a tempore illo dicunt Ecclesiam esse perditare:* "That the cross is the mark of the beast, whereof we read in the Revelation and the abomination standing in the holy place. **They say that blessed Pope Sylvester was the Antichrist,** of whom mention is made in the Epistles of St. Paul, as being the son of perdition, who extols himself above everything that is called God; for, from that time, they say, the Church perished."

We see clearly from this passage, that he confounds the Paterines, or Waldenses, with the Manichees, that having been an opinion of the Waldenses, and not of the Manichees, as the Papists themselves own. He lays it down also as one of their opinions, "That the Law of Moses is to be kept according to the letter, and that the keeping of the Sabbath, Circumcision, and other legal observances, ought to take place. They hold also, that Christ the Son of God is not equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three Persons are not one God and one substance; and, as a surplus to these their errors, they judge and condemn all the doctors of the Church, and universally the whole Roman Church. Now, since they endeavor to defend this their error by testimonies drawn from the New Testament and Prophets, I shall, with assistance of the grace of Christ, stop their mouths, as David did Goliath's, with their own sword."

He in particular sets down their cleaving to the old Law, in his first chapter, wherein he seems better to understand the Scripture than the Church of Rome did, whose Popes, several ages before this, imposed great penances on those who had eaten the flesh of beasts dying of themselves, or of hens drowned in a pit; as we may see in the Penitential Canons. He does not so much as once mention the Arnoldists; and we may take notice that his reason was, because their opinions as to many articles were the same with those he had refuted in the Cathari. What I have already said concerning this matter may suffice; neither is it necessary to repeat the same here.

It is difficult to determine the time wherein this author lived. D'Achery supposeth that he lived towards the end of the twelfth century: but the manner of his speaking concerning the four doctors of the Church, of St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, and St. Augustin, makes me judge that he wrote later.

But not to insist on this, we find, that Alanus attributes to the Cathari almost the very same opinions, in his first book against heretics, which he wrote about the year 1192; and that under that general name which he gives them, he comprehends a great number of sects, who differed from one another in their principles, some of them being Manichees, others Arians, and others again holding the opinions of the Reformed or Protestants. Some of the opinions of these latter you may see in what follows.

HE AFFIRMS, THAT SOME OF THESE HERETICS BELIEVED THAT BAPTISM IS OF NO USE TO INFANTS, because they were not guilty of any sin. And that others of them held, that it was of no use, but only to those who were of age. Others again, that it could not be of any advantage to either of them both. He says that some of them held, that that Sacrament was of no use without the imposition of hands.

I have, in one of the foregoing chapters, made appear upon what occasion some of the diocese of Milan fell into these opinions concerning Baptism; which it is not needful to repeat in this place.

He tells us, that some of them believed that penance was of no use after Baptism, and that they banished all those from their assemblies that sinned after they had been baptized. And that others were of opinion, that penance is of no use for the remission of sins, because that is a work of grace.

He gives us an account of the opinion of others of them, **who maintained it was sufficient for them to confess their sins to God.**

He takes notice, that **they rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation**; and that they condemned it, as being an article that was not to be found in any Creed of the Church.

He saith, there were others amongst them that **rejected Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction**, pretending that they were no sacraments of the Gospel.

That there were others of them that had no regard for churches, and refused to own them for the house of God.

That they **rejected the invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead.** I have given this account of the imputations wherewith Alanus blindly chargeth the Cathari, for so he calls them, in his 63rd chapter, to evidence the sottishness or malice of this author: of his sottishness we may take a scantling by the etymology he gives us of the name Cathari, for he maintains that they got that name from their kissing the hinder part of a cat in their assemblies, the Devil appearing unto them under that form. We may judge of his stupidity by the contrary and contradictory opinions which he heaps up together in the same book, as if they had all of them been defended by the same persons. Valentinians, Marcionites, Manichees, Arians, all comes alike to him, as being names very proper to render his adversaries whatsoever odious, whom he had a design to blacken to the utmost.

We may judge of his malice by his jumbling so different parties together, with design thereby to make a greater impression upon the mind of his reader. It is easy to perceive, that he sets forth the errors of the Cathari, with allusion to the opinions of the Church of Rome: she believed the absolute necessity of Baptism, and she held it for an error either to defer Baptism, as formerly had been practiced, till they were grown up, as well as the opinion of those who condemn her excess in raising it to such a degree of necessity as she does.

She believed the absolute necessity of the Eucharist, as we may see in the synod of Arras, in the life of heretics, and in Alanus; and he calls those heretics who deny this article of faith concerning the Communion.

They were at that time setting up the necessity of confession, and Innocent III. soon after established it by the Canon, *Omni, utriusque sexus*, etc. and yet in the mean time the doctrine of contrition, as restoring a sinner to grace and favor, was still in use. This is that which is owned by Mathoud in *Pullurn Cardinalera*, and by Boileau in his *Treatise of Attrition*; and in the mean time they charge this belief upon the Cathari as a crime.

The power of declaring remission of sin by a laic is of the same nature; the Church of Rome admitted of it, and there have been a thousand examples of it in shipwrecks; and yet in them this is censured by Alanus as an error, because they made use of it as an argument against the absolute authority of the Priests.

It may be some will imagine, that it was Alanus's design to set upon the Albigenses in his first book, as he makes it his business to attack the Waldenses in his second. And probably the Bishop of Meaux would not be wanting to make his observation, that consequently the Albigenses were mere Manichees; which will appear the more probable to him, first, because he chargeth the Waldenses only with some controversies of less importance, which they had with the Church of Rome, concerning discipline. Secondly, that writing to the Earl of Montpellier, he seems rather to have had an eye to the Albigenses, than to the Waldenses, whom he distinguisheth from them, and sets upon in his second book.

But here, first of all, we are to take notice, that the Waldenses and Albigenses had both of them the same belief, as I shall be able to justify with God's assistance. Secondly, we are to observe, that his design being to set forth the Cathari in their colors, without distinguishing them, as Evervinus and Petrus Cluniacensis have done, he raked together all the discourses that had been made against them, without troubling himself about the examining of them. Thirdly, that **since there were some Manichees in the country of the Albigenses, he made it his business to confound them with the true Albigenses, in order to render them the more odious**, and to draw down upon them the aversion and horror of his readers, who were not of sufficient capacity to search into the nature of the opinions which he attributed to them, nor into their connection and incompatibility. Fourthly, we are to observe, that though he lays nothing to the charge of the Waldenses, but controversies of lesser importance in his second book, his reason for that was, because he had already sufficiently comprised them in the first book.

However, I shall presently make it appear, that the difference between the Waldenses and the Church of Rome was not so small, that they could be looked upon only as schismatics, as the Bishop of Meaux has been pleased to imagine; and that the reason why this author thus divided his book, was not to evince, that the Waldenses held no other opinions differing from those of the Church of Rome, but that he might range the questions he designed to treat of under different titles, whosoever they might be whom he was resolved to write against. And for an evident proof that this observation is well grounded, we may take notice, that Gyraldus Cambrensis saith, that the errors of the Patarines, or Cathari, were principally about the Eucharist. It is in a MS. treatise of his, entitled, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, where we find these words; *Deus itaque qui in omnibus operibus suis magnus est, et merito magnificandus, in duobus hic praecepit se magnificum ostendit; quod in illis mundi partibus, in quibus haeretici illi nostri temporis, qui Patari seu Catari dicuntur, et circa hunc praecipue articulum, scilicet de corpore Christi conociendo, errare noscuntur, scilicet in Handrice Snibus, magis abundant, hoc declaravit.* "God therefore, who in all his works is great, and worthily to be magnified, has in these two particulars chiefly glorified himself by declaring this in those parts of the world, viz. on the borders of Flanders, in which those heretics of our time who are called Patarines and Catharines, and who are known chiefly to err about this article of making the body of Christ, do most abound."

CHAPTER 18

That the Patarines and Subalpini were not Manichees, as is evident from their writings, and from their opinions in the twelfth century

After this that I have said concerning the Manichees and the Cathari, it is the easiest thing in the world to justify those called Patarines and those Subalpini, that in the diocese of Turin separated themselves from the favorers of the Roman party, in imitation of the Clergy of Milan, who had their meetings at Pataria.

It is clear enough, that all those authors I have cited to inform us of the opinions of the Cathari, as of a sort of Manichees, had in their prospect many other pretended heresies, which they confounded purposely with the Cathari or Manichees, as soon as they perceived the least conformity between their opinions and those of the Cathari, to make them odious to the people, by insinuating to them that those other, who were separated from the Church of Rome, agreed in all, or almost in all, with the Manichees.

But beyond that, we have a piece dated after the year 1100. of our Lord, entitled, **THE NOBLE LESSON**; which is in the public library of the University of Cambridge, given by Sir Samuel Morland in the year 1658. This MS. is very ancient; and in the body of this old *Noble Lesson* we find these words: Ben ha mil é cent ans compli entierament Che fu scritta loro che son al' derrier temp.

That is, "Eleven hundred years are already past since it was writ, that we are in the last times."

Sir Samuel Morland gives it us at large in his *History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont*.

Those who shall take the pains to read it will find so much piety and purity as to matter of faith in it, that they will hardly be able to suppose a Manichean the author of it. The author, upon supposal that the world was drawing to an end, exhorts his brethren to prayer to watchfulness, to a renouncing of all worldly goods: he enforceth this consideration by the uncertainty of life, and the certainty of death; by representing to them the day of judgment, wherein every one shall receive according to his deeds, either good or evil. He lays down the belief of two ways, the one to glory, for the good, the other to torment, for the wicked, as an article of faith; and he proves it from a review of the whole Scripture, beginning at the history of the creation; concluding, that small is the number of those who shall be saved.

He asserts, that the first principle of those who desire to do good works, is to honor God the Father, to implore the assistance of his glorious Son, and the Holy Ghost, who enlightens us in the true way. He saith, that these three are the Holy Trinity, full of all power, wisdom, and goodness. He bids us pray unto them for necessary assistance to overcome the world, the Devil, and the flesh, to the end we may be able to keep our bodies and souls in the way of charity.

He lays down, that to the love of God we are to join that of our neighbor, which comprehends the love of our enemies.

He speaks of the hope the believer hath of being received up into glory.

He explains the original of evil and sin, which reigns in the world, with reference to the sin of Adam, which brought forth death.

From whence he saith Christ hath redeemed us by his death.

He tells us, that men do imitate Adam in forsaking God, to believe in idols.

He condemns the adulteries, the divisions, and pride, that reign in the world.

He rejects the opinion of those who say, that we ought not to believe that God created man to let him perish, and proves the contrary; maintaining from the Old and New Testament, that only the good shall be saved.

He sets down all the judgments of God in the Old Testament, as the effects of a just and good God; and in particular the Decalogue, as a law given by the Lord of the whole world.

He repeats the several articles of the Law, not forgetting that which respects idols.

After having showed the judgments of God against the wicked Israelites, and his favor towards those that were good amongst them, he sets forth the sending of the Savior into the world; the angel's message to the Virgin; the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost; the Virgin's being betrothed; her virginity; and lastly, the miracles at his birth.

He proceeds to the law of Jesus Christ, which he declares to be nothing else but a renewal and perfecting of the old Law; that the Law only forbade fornication and adultery, but that the Gospel forbids even wanton looks; that the Law gave way to divorce, whereas the Gospel forbids the marrying of one that is divorced, and forbids divorce itself; that the Law cursed those who were barren, whereas the Gospel counsels the keeping in a single state; that the Law forbade all forswearing of one's self, whereas the Gospel forbids us to swear at all, and that our words must be yea and nay. To this purpose he repeats almost all the precepts of Jesus Christ on the mountain, wherein he hath explained the Law, and rendered it more perfect.

He had spoken before of the institution of Baptism by Jesus Christ, and of the order given to his Apostles of baptizing all nations. Afterwards he speaks of the ministry of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, of their poverty, sufferings, doctrine, etc.

He exhorts to the reading of holy Scripture, to know the laws of Jesus Christ; as likewise to be informed that he was only persecuted for his good works.

He observes, that his persecutors were the Pharisees, Herod's men, and the Clergy; that he was betrayed by the avarice of Judas; and that he died on the cross to save men by the bitterness of his sufferings.

He describes the circumstances of the death of our Savior, his wounds, his burial, his resurrection, his showing of himself to his disciples, his ascension into heaven, his promise to his disciples of being with them till the end of the world. He sets forth the miracle of Pentecost, the preaching of the Apostles after they had received the gift of tongues, the manner of their baptizing believers, and the persecution of the apostolical Church.

He compares the persecutors of old, who had not the faith, with those of his time. He denies that ever any of the saints did persecute, but that they were persecuted by others.

He takes notice of the small number of the Apostles, who were the only true doctors, and compares their fewness with the small number of the believers and ministers of his time.

He gives a character of the Waldenses, which is very remarkable: "If a man," saith he, "who loves those that desire to love God and Jesus Christ; if he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lie, nor whore, nor kill, nor deceive his neighbor, nor avenge himself of his enemies, they presently say, He is a Vaudes; he deserves to be punished: and by lies and forging, ways are found to take away from him what he has got by his lawful industry. In the mean time," saith he, "such a one comforts himself in the hope and expectation of eternal salvation."

He mocks at the malice of those who supposed, that people whose life and behavior was contrary to that of the Waldenses, might notwithstanding be good men and true believers. He threatens them with damnation;

representing to them, that a deathbed repentance, and the absolution of a Priest, who does not cause restitution to be made, but who goes snacks with the penitent, promising him to say a Mass for him, and for his ancestors, is of no avail.

He exposeth such confessions and absolutions which were in vogue at that time.

He precisely asserts, that from the time of Sylvester, all the Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, etc. have falsely usurped the power of pardoning sin, which belongs to God alone.

He expresseth himself in terms of so much energy, that I think myself obliged to give the reader a view of them.

For I dare say, and it is very true,
That all the Popes which have been from Sylvester to this present,
And all Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, and the like,
Have no power to absolve or pardon
Any creature so much as one mortal sin;
It is God alone who pardons, and no other.
But this ought they to do who are pastors,
They ought to preach to the people, and pray with them,
And feed them often with divine doctrine;
And chastise the sinners with discipline,
Viz. By declaring that they ought to repent,
First, that they confess their sins freely and fully,
And that they repent in this present life,
That they fast, and give alms, and pray with a fervent heart;
For by these things the soul finds salvation:
Wherefore we Christians, that have sinned,
And forsaken the law of Jesus Christ,
Having neither fear, faith, nor love,
We must confess our sins without any delay,
We must amend with weeping and repentance
The offenses which we have committed, and for those three mortal sins,
To wit, for the lust of the eye, the lusts of the flesh, and the pride of life, through which we have done evil;
We must keep this way.
If we will love and follow Jesus Christ,
We must have spiritual poverty of heart,
And love chastity, and serve God humbly,
For so we may follow the way of Jesus Christ,
And thus we may overcome our enemies.
There is a brief rehearsal in this lesson
Of three laws which God gave to the world;
The first law directeth men who have judgment and reason,
Viz. To know God, and to pray to his Creator.
For he that hath judgment may well think with himself,
That he formed not himself, nor any thing else:
Then here, he who hath judgment and reason may know,
That there is one Lord God, who created all the world,
And knowing him he ought much to honor him;
For they were damned that would not do it.
The second law, which God gave to Moses,
Teacheth us to fear God, and to serve him with all our strength;
For he condemneth and punisheth every one that offends.
But the third law, which is at this present time,
Teacheth us to love God, and to serve him purely:
For he waiteth for the sinner, and giveth him time,
That he may repent in this present life.
As for any law to come after, we shall have none,
Save only to imitate Jesus Christ, and to do his will,

And keep fast that which he commands us,
 And to be well forewarned when Antichrist shall come;
 That we may believe neither his words nor his works;
 Now, according to the Scripture, there are already many Antichrists.
 Many signs and great wonders
 Shall be from this time forward until the day of judgment;
 The heaven and the earth shall burn, and all the living die:
 After which all shall arise to everlasting life,
 And all building shall be laid flat.
 Then shall be the last judgment,
 When God shall separate his people according as it is written,
 To the wicked he shall say,
 Depart ye from me into hell fire, which never shall be quenched;
 With grievous punishments there to be straitened;
 By multitude of pains, and sharp torment:
 For you shall be damned without remedy.
 From which God deliver us, if it be his blessed will,
 And give us to hear that which he shall say to his elect without delay,
 Come hither, ye blessed of my Father,
 Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world,
 Where you shall have pleasure, riches, and honor.
 May it please the Lord which formed the world,
 That we may be of the number of his elect, to dwell in his court for ever.
 Praised be God. Amen.

Now I defy the impudence of the Devil himself to find therein the least shadow of Manicheism.

This poem contains such excellent and Christian lessons, taken out of the Old and New Testament, concerning faith, prayer, charity, chastity, and all parts of morality, that it may well be called a plain extract of scriptural doctrine, suited to persons of mean capacity. **We find therein also a refutation of some errors of the Church of Rome, performed with so much exactness and solidity for a work of that nature, that no Papist can imagine it to be any thing else but the work of a true Christian and Protestant:** but since every one that will may read it, it being translated into English, without which, by reason of the obsolete language, it would be difficult to be understood, I do not think it necessary to set down more of it here.

Only I think myself bound to make some remarks on this tract, to prevent any difficulties that might possibly arise in the mind of the reader.

We may observe, first, that this poem, entitled, *The Noble Lesson*, hath these words,

"That if there be an honest man, who desires to love God and fear Jesus Christ, who will neither slander, nor swear, nor lie, nor commit adultery, nor kill, nor steal, nor avenge himself of his enemies; they presently say of such a one, He is a Vaudes, and worthy of death."

This name of Waldensis was given to the disciples of Peter Waldo, as Peter Vallis Cernaii expressly tells us in his history of the Albigenses; which being so, how can we suppose that this piece was wrote about the year 1100, which is above seventy years before the time wherein Waldo first appeared. This is the first objection will be made against the antiquity of this poem.

The second is, that the Waldenses, or disciples of Waldo, having been particularly famous for their refusing to swear, it seems that this discourse cannot be attributed to any but them; which if so, it would be concluded, that this discourse bears a false date, and is not of that antiquity we pretend.

But it is easy enough to give a satisfactory answer to both these objections. As to the first, we have this to say, that **it is not true, that Waldo gave this name to the inhabitants of the valleys: they were called Waldenses, or Vaudos, before his time, from the valleys in which they dwell.** This we find in P. Damian's letters, who calls them Subalpini, that is, the same as Waldenses, and in Ebrardus de Bethune,

who wrote in the year 1212, where he asserts, that they called themselves Wallenses, *quia in valle lachrymarum manerent*; "because they abode in the valley of tears:" **so that we see that this etymology rather has respect to the place where they lived, which was in the valleys of Piedmont, than to the name of Peter Waldo.**

For the second, I confess it would have been of some strength, in case the disciples of Waldo had been the first that in the diocese of Italy had declared their aversion from oaths: but we have clearly showed from Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, and others, that **this opinion took place in that diocese long before Peter Waldo was born**; and besides this, we know that it was an ordinary thing amongst the primitive Christians to forbid swearing upon any account whatsoever. There are some passages of Scripture, which seem so express as to this point, that we need not wonder if the Christians of that diocese were led by them, especially before they had examined the whole Scripture throughout; which was not an easy matter for them to do, the whole body of Scripture being not yet translated, that we know, but only some parts of it, and that by the labor and care of Peter Waldo.

I find nothing more that can rationally be objected against so express a testimony, which carries the date of the time inserted in the body of the treatise, but only this, which the Bishop of Meaux seems to have had an eye to, viz. that the language in which that piece is written seems to bespeak it of a later date than the beginning of the twelfth century; the style of it wholly agreeing with those treatises that are confessedly of a more modern date, though they have been published as written in the year 1120, or, at least, within the compass of the twelfth century.

To which I have two things to answer; the first is, that it cannot be thought so strange a thing, that some have attributed to the pieces I have rejected a greater antiquity than really they had, as being found in MS. joined to a piece which signifies the date of its composure. This is a mistake very incident to such who are not perfectly well versed in the critical examination of MSS. But however, this cannot prejudice the authority of a book that bears its own date.

The second thing I have to say in favor of the antiquity of the *Noble Lesson* is this; that though I cannot judge of the style of that piece by comparing it with other Italian monuments of the beginning of the twelfth century, as having no MS. of that age, nor compare it with the style of those ages that immediately followed it, in order to discern the difference between them; nevertheless thus much we may assert, First, That if they yet spake Latin in Italy at the beginning of the twelfth century, as may be judged from this, that St. Bernard, who was a Frenchman, spake without an interpreter in the churches of Pisa, Milan, and other Italian churches, though indeed **the case of Italy was like that of other places; where, though the Latin tongue were understood by most, yet the people had their particular language they used amongst themselves: for Peter Waldo's translating of the Bible, which must have been done before the year 1180, shows, that in France there was already a language different from the Latin tongue, and which was more commonly and generally understood: and it would be easy for us to prove, that in like manner they had at that time in Italy a language different from the Roman, distinguished into several dialects, according to the distinct provinces thereof, and much resembling the language spoken in Provence, which owes its original to the Limosine tongue, which is a corruption of the Latin.**

The gentlemen of the University of Cambridge, who have in their custody the MSS. of divers pieces of the Waldenses, and amongst them an old MS. of some books of the Old and New Testament, gives me a fair occasion to help the reader to make this comparison; though I must confess it to be a thing of difficulty to accomplish, because, although those MSS. of some parts of the Bible are very ancient, it ordinarily happens, that in these sort of books, which are for the use of the people, men from time to time reform and alter the style, that so they may not sound uncouth and barbarous to the people; which cannot so well be done in a piece of poetry, wherein nothing can be easily changed, without spoiling the whole composure.

I do not intend here, in order to prove the opinions of the diocese of Italy, to make use of a Catechism published by Sir Sam Morland, and by Leger, as written about the year 1100, nor of another treatise of the Invocation of Saints, which they pretend was written about the year 1120; my reason is, because it seems to me that that Catechism quotes the Scripture, as distinguished into chapters, which was not till after the midst of the thirteenth century. And as for the treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints, it quotes the

Milleloquium of St. Austin, which was not composed by Ft. Bartholomeus of Urbin till about the midst of the fourteenth century. **So that it seems these gentlemen founded their judgments of the antiquity of these pieces on too weak grounds.**

However, it will be easy for us to make out, without the assistance of any doubtful authorities, that the twelfth century did not only preserve the opinions of the Patarines, but also made them more clear and distinct; which will appear, if we examine the opinions of Arnoldus Brixiensis, as well as the writings of zealous Papists, against those whom they nicknamed Cathari, with design to make them pass for Manichees.

We may truly say, that scarcely any man was ever so defamed and torn, because of his doctrine, as was this **ARNOLDUS BRIXIENSIS**: would we know the reason of it? **It was because with all his power he opposed the tyranny and usurpation which the Popes began to establish at Rome,** over the temporal jurisdiction of the Emperor. He was the man who by his counsel renewed the design of reestablishing the authority of the senate in Rome, and of obliging the Pope not to meddle with any thing but what concerned the government of the Church, without invading the temporal jurisdiction. He it was that made the senate and people of Rome send to the Emperor Frederic, to know his resolution in the point, and to acquaint him with the proceedings they had already begun against the King of Sicily and the Pope, in order to restore Rome to the Emperors, and to make it the head of the empire, as it had been of old, without abandoning it to the power of the Pope and his Clergy. This letter is set down by Otho Frisingensis. This was his crime; and this indeed is such a one as is unpardonable with the Popes, if there be any such.

As for the qualifications of this Arnold, the same Bishop Otho sets him forth to us as a man who, being but a simple reader of the Church of Breseia, for the love he bare to learning, traveled into France, to be an auditor of Abelardus, who at that time was the common master of learned men. He tells us, that upon his return to Italy, being endowed with happy natural parts, and a great easiness of expressing himself, he behaved himself very regularly as to his manners, and took upon him the habit of a Monk, as a mark of the love he had for piety. This truth cannot be acknowledged more plainly and distinctly than it is by St. Bernard. Otho sets him forth as a man loving singularity and novelty, and gives him a character very proper and agreeable to a schismatic and heretical ringleader. He grounds his judgment upon this, because upon his return into Italy, he began to censure the Clergy, the Bishops, and the Monks, and to seek the favor of laymen. *Dicebat enim, nec Clericos proprietatem, nec Episcopos regalia, nec Monaehos possessiones habentes, aliqua ratione posse salvari. Cuncta haec Principis esse, ab ejusque beneScientia in usum tantum Clericorum cadere oportere.* "For, he maintained, that no Clergymen enjoying propriety, nor Bishops having regal jurisdiction, nor Monks having any possessions, could possibly be saved: that all these things belonged to the Prince; and that it was only from his beneficence the Clergy were to partake of them."

This same thing St. Bernard also I reproacheth him with. Those who have been a little conversant in the history of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth, and who know the horrid dissoluteness that then reigned amongst the Clergy, and in monasteries, will find no great fault with him for these his opinions. Those who shall be pleased only to peruse the books of St. Bernard, *De Consideratione*, to Pope Eugenius II. will easily acquit him of the accusations laid to his charge by Otho Frisingensis.

But there was yet a more heinous thing laid to his charge, which was this: *Propter haec, de sacramento altaris, baptismo parvulorum, non sane dicitur sensisse*: "Besides this, it was said of him, that he was unsound in his judgment about the sacrament of the altar and infant baptism."

And this was matter enough to condemn him; for as he thus industriously set himself to oppose the growing errors in the Church of Brescia, where he was born, being supported by Maifredus, Consul of that city; as Ughellus assures us, he was set upon by the Bishop of Brescia, and some other religious persons, who accused him to the Council of Rome, under **Innocent II. who imposed silence upon him**, lest such a pernicious doctrine should spread itself any farther. Otho tells us, that hereupon he retired out of Italy, and settled himself in a place of Germany called Furego, or Zurich, belonging to the diocese of Constance; as may be gathered from the 195th Epistle of St. Bernard to the Bishop of Constance, where he continued to disseminate his doctrine. Otho tells us, that he continued there till the death of Innocent II. and that he

came to Rome at the beginning of the papacy of Eugenius II. which shows, that the letter which St. Bernard writ to the Bishop of Constance did not much lessen his credit, or do him any great prejudice.

But we proceed to the upshot of his history, which take as follows, from the relation of the aforesaid Otho.

"Being entered into the city, and finding it altogether in a seditious uproar against the Pope, he was so far from following the advice of the Wise Man, not to add fuel to the fire, that he greatly increased it, propounding to the multitude the examples of the ancient Romans, who by the maturity of their senators' counsels, and the valor and integrity of their youth, made the whole world their own. Wherefore he persuaded them to rebuild the Capitol, to restore the dignity of the Senate, to reform the order of Knights. He maintained, that nothing of the government of the city did belong to the Pope, who ought to content himself only with his ecclesiastical censures. And so far did the mischief of this infectious doctrine prevail, not only to the pulling down of several of the Roman nobility and Cardinals' houses, but also to the personal abuse of some of the reverend Cardinals, who were wounded by the raging mobile."

He could not think to escape long, after committing so heinous a crime against persons extremely jealous of their tyranny.

"And as he for many days, that is, from Caelistine's death to these times, incessantly and irreverently proceeded in these and such like enterprises, contemning the sentence of the Clergy, justly and canonically pronounced against him, as altogether void, and of no authority; he fell at last into the hands of some, on the borders of Tuscany, who took him prisoner, and being preserved for the Prince's trial, he was at last, by the Prefect of the city, **hanged, and his body burnt to ashes**, (to prevent the foolish rabble from expressing any veneration for his body,) and the ashes of it cast into the Tybur."

This was the end of this great man, which was a sufficient evidence of the veneration which the people of Rome had for him, whose interests he had so courageously undertaken to maintain against the tyranny of the Popes, who without any title or right, except that of their ambition, endeavored to subject Rome to their power, and to set up themselves for sovereigns there.

We find a confirmation of all this in Guntherus, who in verse has described the life of Frederick. Those who are never so little acquainted with history cannot be ignorant how furiously, for almost a whole century, the Popes and their partisans were engaged about the right of investitures, whereof they had a mind to deprive the Emperors; so that we cannot conceive a greater occasion of hatred in the Popes against any man, than was that which had set them against this Arnold, who stood up for the Emperor's rights. But the sovereignty of Rome, which they so much affected, and he so briskly opposed, filled up the measure of his crimes, and some of the Emperor's men having taken him, probably out of complaisance to the Pope, sacrificed him to the ambition of the papacy.

However thus much is certain, that this bloody execution was very far from pleasing all men; as we may see from the complaints Gebhardus makes upon that account, who looked upon it as a crying piece of injustice, the guilt whereof did lie upon the Bishop of Rome, and his Clergy, who were the procurers thereof. The good man, it seems, was not over-well informed, that the Church of Rome had studied the art of ruling, according to which, crimes are not so narrowly to be sifted, as long as they do but serve to confirm the pretensions of ambition to the sovereign power.

Neither did this Arnold want followers, who upon this occasion separated themselves from the Church of Rome; as may be seen by a writing published soon after by Bonacursus, Bishop of the Cathari of Milan; for this author concludes his work with a long chapter against the Arnoldists, after he became a convert.

In short, the pretended error of Arnoldus Brixiensis was evidently against the definitions of the Church of Rome: he had for a long time been the disciple and companion of Abelardus, whence we may conjecture, that he had also espoused his opinions in the point of the Eucharist, and consequently, that **he was very far removed from the belief of Rome**. Indeed, we find that St. Bernard, sending to Pope Innocent II. a catalogue of the errors of Abelardus, accuseth him of teaching concerning the Eucharist, that the accidents

subsisted in the air, but not without a subject, and that when a rat doth eat the Sacrament, God withdraws whither he pleaseth, and preserves where he pleases the body of Jesus Christ. This is found in a MS. of one of St. Bernard's Epistles, and has been suppressed by those who caused his works to be printed. But perhaps it will seem more probable, that this was rather a piece of raillery, or consequence from the doctrine of transubstantiation, objected by Abelardus, than any positive opinion of his. Those who are acquainted with his genius, and have read his works, will judge hereof as I do.

After all, we have good ground to believe, that Arnoldus Brixiensis held the opinions of Berengarius, as those of Italy did, who renounced the Pope's communion; for he absolutely condemned the ministry of the Church of Rome, as appears from the book of Bonacursus already quoted. Indeed it seems difficult to believe, that he should have quitted the opinion of his country about the Eucharist, whilst he continued to be of their opinion in that which was the most important and capital article of all.

CHAPTER 19

That the Churches of Italy were not founded by Peter Waldo

After all that I have before observed concerning the original of the Patarines, of their opposite opinions to those of the Church of Rome, the spreading of their disciples through several countries of Europe, it appears very evident, that the keeping of the truth in the diocese of Italy, and particularly in the diocese of Turin, and in the valleys thereabout, was the work of these Patarines and Subalpini, and that we cannot, with any show of justice, attribute the same to Peter Waldo. **What kind of person this Waldo was, whether a simple laic, or a Manichee, will be of no concern to Churches which subsisted long before him, under a ministry distinguished from that of the Church of Rome.** Yet so it has happened by the malice of the Papists, in calumniating these Churches, and the inadvertency of diverse Protestant authors, that it is scarce possible fully to satisfy our readers, without showing what share Waldo had in this reformation, which is ordinarily attributed to him, because it has pleased the Roman party to denominate these Churches from Waldo, as if it was he who had first founded them. **Whereas I affirm, that we are wholly beholden for this notion to the Papists, who made it their business to persuade men, that before Waldo began to contradict the Bishop of Lyons, and to propound new doctrines, which happened a little before the end of the twelfth century, there was never a Church, either in Italy or elsewhere, that was of his belief. It is for this reason they so much affected to fix the name of Waldenses on those who were of his opinion.** This we may see in Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, as well as in Alanus, who wrote before the end of the twelfth century. The polemical writers, of the past and foregoing ages, have made use of this mistake by a kind of prescription against the novelty of the reformation. And as it ordinarily happens that men suffer themselves to be caught by the sound of words, and by these kind of prejudices, which are set forth with so much affectation, it cannot be denied, but that some Protestants, on this occasion, have fallen into the snare that was set for them.

Wherefore, that I may once for all clear this matter, I say, first, that it is absolutely false, that these Churches were ever founded by Peter Waldo. Let them show us any author of that time, who asserts, that Peter Waldo ever preached in the diocese of Italy, or that he founded any Church there. Let them produce any sure tradition of that people referring the original of their Churches to Peter Waldo. Those who wrote at that time do not tell us any thing like this, no more than they who lived after. **Wherefore we must needs conclude it a pure forgery to look upon Waldo as the person who first brought the reformation into Italy we now find there. I own, indeed, that by Peter Waldo's taking care to have the holy Scripture translated into the vulgar tongue, the Churches of Italy reaped much benefit from that version, whereof we have to this day some old copies in the library of the University of Cambridge. But this does not in the least infer, that Waldo ought to be considered as the founder of them.** I say further, that by the acknowledgment of the enemies themselves of the Waldenses, it is absolutely false, that these Churches are of no older standing than Peter Waldo. **FOR THIS WE HAVE THE CONFESSION OF RAYNERUS, AN INQUISITOR, WHO LIVED BEFORE THE MIDDLE OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.** He ingenuously acknowledgeth,

"That the heresy of those he calls Vaudois, or poor people of Lyons, was of great antiquity. Amongst all sects, saith he, cap. 4. that either are or have been, there is none more dangerous to the Church than that of the Leonists, and that for three reasons: the first is, because it is the sect that is of the longest standing of any; **for some say it hath been continued down ever since the time of Pope Sylvester, and others, ever since that of the Apostles.** The second is, because it is the most general of all sects; **for scarcely is there any country to be found, where this sect hath not spread itself.**"

Now, it is clearer than the sun, that Raynerus would never have talked at this rate, if he had known, that the first rise of this sect was not above seventy years before he wrote this treatise; as we must acknowledge, if we suppose Waldo to be the founder of it. It is also unquestionably plain, that it was impossible for a sect to spread itself so far and wide in so short a space of time.

The Bishop of Meaux highly chargeth **Beza for saying, that the Waldenses, time out of mind, had stiffly opposed the abuses of the Romish Church, and that they held their doctrine from father to son, ever since the year 120, as they had heard and received it from their elders and ancestors.** He tells us, that the first disciples of Waldo were content to allege for themselves, that they had separated themselves from the Romish Church, at the time when, under Pope Sylvester, she had accepted of temporal endowments and possessions: a pretension which the Bishop of Meaux calls ridiculous, as well as the former. The reader who has perused my observations will be able to judge whether the Waldenses did falsely boast of their apostolical antiquity. And as for that which was just now mentioned, that the first disciples of Waldo did distinctly determine the date of their separation from the Romish Church, to the pontificate of Pope Sylvester, I own, with him, that the tradition is not founded upon any sure proof. But however thus much may be said to justify the Waldenses, that as they had no exact knowledge of history, so it would be very unjust to charge this their ignorance upon them as some heinous crime, at a time especially when darkness covered the face of the Romish Church, and wherein the greatest doctors of that proud communion were no better than very children in that point. But if we search this matter to the bottom, who was it that first invented this fable, that the Church was fallen into a prodigious corruption, upon occasion of the temporal endowments bestowed upon her at the time of Pope Sylvester? Is it not notorious, that they were the Popes themselves who caused the false donation of Constantine to be published, which was made before the year 850, to give themselves by this forgery an anterior title to what they held in Italy, than those late donations of Pepin and Charles the Great, and thereby gave occasion to the dating the corruption of the Church from the time of Constantine? Are the Waldenses so unpardonably guilty for having made this the date of their reformation, since they never pretended to be great critics, and when they saw that the Church of Rome, and the Popes upon such a title, made it their only business to subject all the world to themselves, *per fasque nefasque*, right or wrong, which they pretended had been formerly bestowed upon them by Constantine?

After all, the Bishop of Meaux knows well enough that this donation was made use of in the time of Otho I. to lessen the acknowledgment which was due to him from the Church of Rome, and that the same was inserted by Gratian in his decree, before the middle of the twelfth century. Who are they that allege this in their disputes? Is it not the Church of Rome and her partisans? If we doubt of it, we need only to read Ecbert's treatise against the Cathari, and we shall be fully convinced of it. He wrote about the year 1160. And since the diocese of Italy was then already separated from the Church of Rome, their posterity being deceived by the fraudulent pretences of the Papists, gave occasion to these honest people to conceit that their ancestors first appeared in the time of Constantine. But pray, does not this pretension of theirs naturally suppose, that a long time before there was in Italy a body of men separated from the Church of Rome, though, for want of skill in history, they were ignorant of the exact time of their separation from the Romish party?

But in the mean time, will some say, sure it is, that Raynerus gives the name of Waldenses to those of Italy against whom he writes. I confess he has done so, when he calls them Leonists: but we are also to take notice, that a more ancient author, whom Raynerus quotes, viz. Tonson the Monk, calls them Patarines, Rayner. cap. 6; which is sufficient to justify their antiquity, according to what we have made out in the foregoing chapter.

I own, that sometimes the Churches of the Valleys have been denominated from Waldo, because he had a great number of disciples, who joined themselves with those who were already separated from the Romish Church; but I utterly deny once more, that ever they were absolutely called by the name of Waldenses, because he was the first founder of their sect. This is that which I undertake to make out beyond all possible contradiction.

1. These believers of the Valleys could not be so called from Valdo of Lyons, because he did not flourish at the soonest till the year 1160, according to Roger Hoveden, whereas the **people of the Valleys of Lucerne and Angrogne had the name of Wallenses from the beginning of the twelfth century**, I have already made it appear, that they separated themselves from the Church of Rome long before, and that the name of Wallenses, or Vaudois, was given them from the place of their abode, which the inhabitants called *les Vaus de Lucerne et Angrogne*, that is to say, the Valleys of Lucerne and Angrogne, from whence came the Latin name *Vallenses*, which was afterward changed to *Valdenses*, when the design was laid to make men believe that Valdo was their first founder. This is that which I have made out from Eberard de Betbune, cap. 25.

Moreover, that they were called Vaudois before Valdo, is evident from the poem which is called, *The Noble Lesson*, which is in the University library of Cambridge, which bears date anno 1100, where they are so called.

2. I say, that Waldo could not possibly give them his name, till after he had been condemned by the Archbishop of Lyons, which was not till about the year 1172, by John de Beauxmains; if so be it were he that persecuted them.

3. I say, that in the Council of Lateran, under Alexander III. in the year 1179, they are not called Vaudois, but Patarines. True it is, that Gualterus Mappeus, who assisted at that council, where he disputed against them, calls them Valdesii, and speaks of them, as if they had got that name from Petrus Valdo, who had been very famous amongst them. But it is apparent that he did so only to abuse them.

Accordingly we find that the canon of the Lateran Council speaks only of the Albigenses, though it is evident **he bestowed the several names upon them of Cathari, Patarines, and Publicans only, to render them the more odious**; either as having been restorers of old heresies, or as corresponding with the heretics of the diocese of Italy, or as being downright Manichees, which the term Publican implies, as we have had occasion to observe elsewhere.

It may possibly be objected against what I have now said, that divers authors have maintained, that Peter Waldo was the author of the opinions of those who were called Vaudois in the twelfth century. This is that which is maintained by Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, published by Gretser and by Alanus, in his book against the Vaudois, dedicated to William, Earl of Montpellier.

But I have two things to answer, sufficient to satisfy any equitable reader: the first is, that whereas this Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, who was of the order of the Premonstratensians, entitles his book against the sect of the Vaudois and Arians, he did not speak so, pag. 1198. B. P. T. 6, but by wilful mistake: for, 1, he calls them Valenses in his title, *Incipit Tractatus Bernardi contra Falenses et Arianos*. The title of Valenses was their ancient name, taken from the place of their habitation, and not from the name of Waldo. 2. That the reason which he had to make them Waldo's disciples, was on purpose to have an advantage against them, from the condemnation of their doctrine by Pope Lucius III. We have this condemnation in that Canon, cap. ad abolendum Decret. Grego. lib. 5: tit. 7. c. 9. Whence it appears, that the Pope thereby pretended to condemn two sorts of persons, who were equally opposite to the Church of Rome.

1. Those who were schismatics from that Church, and whom she had pretended to forbid the exercise of Orders, as judging that their ministry could be no longer lawful or valid after such prohibition.

2. Those whom she looked upon either as not ordained at all, or ill ordained; as deriving their mission from those whom the Church of Rome had condemned. The words are these:

Imprimis Catharos et Paterinos, et eos qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso noraine, mentiuntur, Passaginos, Josepinos, Arnoldistus, perpetuo decernimus anathemati subiacere. Et quoniam nonnulli sub specie pietatis, virtutem edus, juxta quod ait Apostolus, denegantes, auctoritatem sibi vindicant praedicandi omnes qui vel prohibiti, vel non missi, prater auctoritatem ab apostolica sede, vel ab Episcopo loci susceptam, publice vel private praedicare praesumpserint; et universos qui de Sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel de Baptismate, sen de Peccatorum Confessione, Matrimonio, vel reliquis Ecclesiasticis sacramentis aliter sentire aut docere non metuunt, quam sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana praedicat et observat vinculo perpetui anathematis innodamus.

"In the first place we decree and judge, that **the Cathari and Patarines, and those who falsely take to themselves the name of the humble or poor of Lyons, as well as Passaginos, Josephines, Arnoldists, lie under a perpetual anathema**. And forasmuch as some, under the show of piety, but denying (as the Apostle saith) the power thereof, take upon themselves the authority of preaching whosoever are either prohibited or not sent, and nevertheless presume to preach, either privately or publicly, without any authority derived from the apostolic see, or from the Bishop of the diocese; as likewise all those who are not afraid to entertain different opinions, or teach otherwise concerning the Sacrament of the body and blood

of our Lord Jesus Christ, or of Baptism, or the Confession of sins, Matrimony, or other sacraments of the Church, than the holy Church of Rome teacheth and observes we do herewith bind under a perpetual anathema."

What I assert doth further clearly appear from these other terms used by Pope Lucius, who, though he maintains that the heresies, which he mentions, were sprung up *modernis temporibus*, of late time, yet takes in with them the Arnoldists, whose rise was above sixty years before that: Arnoldus Brixienesis having been burnt at Rome in the year of our Lord 1155, as appears from historians.

As for Alanus, it is apparent that he followed the same method.

1. He takes notice only of the Albigenses, against whom he writes, dedicating his book to the Earl of Montpellier, under the title of Waldo's disciples; and he seems extremely pleased, that he had this their original to object to them, which, as he supposed, might serve for a prescription, his heresy having been condemned in the Lateran Council, anno 1179.

2. It is apparent that he pleased himself in confounding the disciples of Waldo, who had caused the Old and New Testament to be translated, and had writ explanations upon it, before the year 1179, with the Manichees, who, we know, rejected those books. I shall elsewhere lay open the first rise and injustice of this calumny.

So that all that can be said with any certainty in this matter is, that some of Waldo's disciples did probably join themselves with the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, being constrained thereto by the persecution which dispersed them far and near. But withal it is most true,

1. That Waldo was not the founder of the Churches of the Valleys, which were in being long before him.

2. That it does not appear that he had any communion with them: the authors who speak of him telling us, that he retired into Flanders and Picardy.

3. That he died before the year 1179, as appears from the account Gulielmus Mapeus gives us.

4. That the greatest part of his disciples spread themselves amongst the Albigenses, according to the testimony of historians, which Albigenses were in being before Waldo, as may be seen by the 65th Sermon of St. Bernard upon the Canticles.

5. That those of them that came into Italy did not give their name to the Churches of that country, who before that were called Wallenses, from the place of their abode, and that it was only the malice of their enemies that made them pass for the disciples of Peter Waldo.

CHAPTER 20

Whether the Waldenses were at first only Schismatics

The Bishop of Meaux maintains, that the Waldenses were a distinct sect from the Albigenses, whom he terms Manichees. He pretends that the separation of the Waldenses was for a long time no more than a schism; "Because, saith he, when they first separated themselves from the Church of Rome, they had but very few opinions that were contrary to those of that Church, or, it may be, none at all."

He pretends they owe their rise solely to Peter Waldo, a merchant of Lyons, wherein he follows Raynerus, cap. 5. That the said Waldo, following the motions of a pious zeal, but ill informed, and being touched with the words of the Gospel, where poverty is so highly commended, persuaded himself, that the apostolical life was no longer to be found on the earth, and therefore selling all that he had, resolved to restore and renew it again: that this his example was imitated by many, who were touched with compunction. He afterwards accuseth them in the same discourse, affecting to live upon alms, which made them at first to be taxed with ostentation and affectation of a proud and idle poverty. Afterwards he accuseth them, in imitation of Pilikdorph, that having considered that the Apostles were not only poor, but preachers also, they took upon them the office of preaching without mission, from which being barred by the Bishops and the holy, they thence took occasion to murmur against the Clergy, who opposed their doctrine, as they said, only out of jealousy, and because their doctrine and holy life east shame and reproach upon their corrupt manners. This being the original of their schism, according to the Bishop of Meaux.

Moreover he maintains, that Waldo was not a man of learning, but that he had cunning enough to draw in persons as ignorant as himself. He observes, that this sect, which began now to increase, was condemned by Lucius III. as Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, asserts, who saw the beginnings of it, and who tells us, that this condemnation happened before the year 1185.

Lastly, he pretends that they denied none of the doctrines which the Church of Rome teacheth; so that the sect of the Waldenses is a kind of Donatism. This is that the Bishop of Meaux strongly endeavors to prove;

1. By making it appear, that the first conferences that were held with them were about the right they took to themselves of preaching without the authority of the Bishops, and against their prohibition, and upon some other questions of the like nature.

2. Because we do not find that ever they opposed either the real presence, or the sacrifice of the Mass, nor the Sacraments of the Romish Church, nor any other of those doctrines which the Protestants do reject. That it was only about the year 1532 that they joined themselves with the Protestants, and adopted the opinions of the Reformation.

Now, forasmuch as the Bishop of Meaux has taken a great deal of pains in this matter, and that he pretends to have cited all the authors that speak of the manner of their schism, and of the number of their errors, it will be necessary to make a nearer inspection into the matters he with so much confidence does assert.

And here it would be sufficient to observe,

1. That all this is little or nothing at all to our question. If the Bishop should prove that some of Waldo's disciples were only laics, yet would it not follow from thence, that the Churches of the Valleys, amongst whom they retired, were nothing else but assemblies of laymen. We have made out the contrary concerning the Patarines, whose separation from the Church of Rome laid the foundation of the Churches of the Valleys.

2. That it is very evident from the bull of Lucius III, whereof I have quoted some part in the foregoing chapter, that **the Patarines had divided themselves from the Church of Rome, not only upon the questions of discipline, but also upon several other questions concerning the sacraments; and for which reason that Pope terms them heretics.** So that it appears, that the Bishop of Meaux was so wholly bent to persuade his reader that Waldo was the founder of the Churches of Italy, that he has with all the care imaginable concealed from him whatsoever might make him know that there were Churches in those Valleys before Waldo.

But without engaging any further at present in that question, whether the Waldenses were only laymen, it will be easy to convince the Bishop of the falseness of all his pretensions, from those very authors which himself has produced on this occasion.

I begin with the second article, because on its decision depends that of the first, viz. Whether the Waldenses did entertain any opinions contrary to those of the Church of Rome. It was not merely from a spirit of schism that they separated themselves from the Church of Rome, though they did set forth the corruption which reigned amongst the ministers of that communion; yet was it not this corruption alone that was the motive of their separation. But I do not intend to pass by the first article, as it is set down by the Bishop, because he took this way only to impose upon his reader, though probably he also may have been imposed upon, for want of due consideration.

I maintain therefore, that the notion which the Bishop of Meaux gives his reader concerning the Waldenses, as if they had been only schismatics, is one of the falsest notions imaginable. I have made out, as may be seen by solid proofs, that they opposed themselves against the errors of the Church of Rome, and that they made them the motive of their separation. Lucius III. was well informed of this, when he condemned them, cap. ad abolendum, P. 97. Directorii. Conrad. Abbot of Ursberg, speaking of this condemnation, acknowledgeth, ad an. 1212, that Pope Lucius "put them into the catalog of heretics, because of some superstitious doctrines and observances."

Which are the very words that the Bishop allegeth. The same thing appears from the edict of King Alphonsus, published in the year 1194, in execution of the bull of Lucius III.

Pope Innocent III. in his Epistle, writ in 1198, plainly declares, that he took them for heretics, speaking of the Waldenses and Albigenses, as being engaged in the same doctrine. This letter was directed to the Prelates of South France, and to the neighboring Bishops of Spain, where the Waldenses had a great number of followers.

The Bishop thinks to invalidate these proofs by two means, that seem very plausible; the one is, that Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, relates a conference held at Narbonne, at the end of the twelfth century, where only four articles were handled, which all of them referred to questions of schism. The other is, that in the year 1212. the Waldenses came to Rome, to obtain the approbation of their sect, which was refused them. If the Bishop had seen the extract of Mappeus, published by the learned Bishop Usher, he would not have failed to have made the same reflections upon it; Mappeus observing that some of the Waldenses were come to Rome, under Alexander III. in 1179, to ask leave of the Pope to preach, which was refused them.

But as to the Bishop's first proof, he therein abuseth his reader; for we are to take notice, that this conference was only about the preliminaries, without entering upon the examination of the more fundamental articles. Indeed they were only some prejudices urged against them, on purpose to hinder them from coming to the main points in question; a method of prescription, whereof the Romish party have endeavored to serve themselves long time since, to stave off the examination of those articles which reproached and exposed their corruption.

We know with what impudence the polemical writers of the Church of Rome have employed this method against the Church of England, though they were sufficiently convinced of the validity of their ministry.

The other reflection of the Bishop of Meaux about the business of these Waldenses at Rome, under Alexander III. and afterwards under Innocent III. has no more ground than the former. The decree of Lucius

III. exposed the disciples of Waldo to the persecution from the Emperor Frederick I. who at that time gave up his power to the Church of Rome. And the same was yet more rudely carried on under Innocent III. Whereupon some of this poor people looking upon the Pope as the cause of all their sufferings, thought they might either justify their innocence, by declaring their opinions in opposition to these their adversaries, who accused them of being no better than pure Manichees, or else be allowed to preach by the Pope's general consent; much like what we read often about those times, that persons that were already Priests went to the Pope to obtain the liberty of preaching and wearing sandals, which was then the mark of preachers: but the refusal that was returned them, and the Pope's inciting princes to wage war against the Albigenses, and the proceedings afterwards of Pope Innocent against them in the Lateran Council, in the year 1215, are sufficient arguments that they did not agree in their doctrines about matters of faith.

Neither indeed have the Popish authors been backward in setting down the errors Wherewith they pretended they were chargeable. St. Bernard, in his 63rd and 66th sermon upon the Canticles, speaking concerning the heretics, whom he calls Cathari, acknowledgeth, that they rejected prayers for the dead, as also those addressed to saints. Pamelius pretends, that he spake as plainly of the Waldenses as any of those that have written since against them. But possibly the Bishop may not think these to be matters of heresy; at least he speaks very favorably of them in his exposition of the Roman faith: wherefore we shall make it appear, that they differed from the Church of Rome on other articles.

RAYNERIUS, A JACOBITE, ATTRIBUTES TO THEM THIRTY-THREE ERRORS, whereof Coussord has published an extract in these words: *Hic fuit primus eorum error, contemptus ecclesiasticæ potestatis. Ex hoc traditi sunt Sathanae, præcipitati ab ipso in errores innumeros, et antiquorum hæreticorum errores suis adinventionibus miscuerent. Et quia ejecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica, se solos Christi Ecclesiam esse, et Christi discipulos affirmant. Dicunt se Apostolorum successores, et habere auctoritatem apostolicam, ferunt esse meretricem Babylonem, omnesque illi obedientes damnari; maxime Clericos ei obedientes a tempore Sylvestri Papæ. Nulla miracula videntur esse quæ fiunt in Ecclesia, quia nullus eorum aliquando miracula fecit. Omnia Ecclesiæ statuta post Christi ascensionem dicunt non esse servanda, nec alicujus esse valoris; festa, feriarum jejunia, ordines, benedictiones, officia Ecclesiæ, et similia, respuunt omnino. Ecclesias consecratas, coemeteria, ac omnia talia, infamant, et clamant ea pro avaritia solum a Clericis instituta, ut ea ad suum quaestum reducant, quo a subditis hac occasione pecuniam et oblationes exquirant. Tum primo hominem baptizari dicunt, cum in eorum sectam fuerit inductus. Quidam eorum baptismum parvulis non valere tradunt, eo quod nondum actualiter credere possunt. Confirmationiones sacramentum respuunt: sed eorum magistri manus imponunt discipulis vice illius sacramenti. Episcopos, Clericos, ac Religiosos Ecclesiæ, Scribas et Phariseos aiunt esse, et Apostolorum persecutores. Corpus Christi et sanguinem verum esse sacramentum non credunt, sed panem benedictum, qui in figura quadam dicitur corpus Christi, sicut dicitur, Petra autem est Christus, et similia. Quisam autem hoc dicunt tantum per bonos fieri; alii, per omnes qui verba consecrationis sciunt: hoc in conventiculis suis celebrant, verba illa Evangelii recitantes in mensa sua, sibi que mutuo participant, sicut in Coena christi. Dicunt quod peccator Sacerdos aliquem solvere aut ligare non possit, cum ipse sit ligatus peccator: et quod quilibet bonus et sciens laicus alium absolvere valeat, et poenitentiam injungere. Extremam unctionem respuunt, dicentes potius maledictiones esse quam sacramentum. Matrimonium, inquiunt, fornicatio est jurata, nisi continenter visvant; quaslibet enim immundicias magis licitas habent quam conjugalem copulam. Continentiam laudant quidem, sed inurent libidine concedunt ei satisfieri debere, quocunque modo turpi; exponentes illud Apostolus, Melius est nubere quam uri, quod melius sit quolibet actu turpi libidini satisfacere, quam in corde tentari: sed hoc valde tenent occultum, ne vilescant. Si aliqua honesta mulier, quæ casta putatur, puerum peperit, occultant et tradunt eum alibi alendum, ne prodatur. Omne juramentum illicitum esse perhibent inde vero et mortale peccatum; sed dispensant, ut juret quis pro evadenda morte corporis, ne alios prodatur, aut secretum revelet perfidiae suæ. Prodere hæreticum, crimen esse dicunt inexpiabile, et peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum. Nec malefactores per seculare judicium occidi lacere dicunt. Quidam eorum nec bruta animalia, veluti pisces et hujusmodi, occidenda esse putant: cum autem ea manducare volunt, super ignem et fumum suspendunt donec moriantur. Pulices et similia animalia excutiunt extra, aut vestem ipsam in aquam calidam intingunt; et tunc ea occidisse volunt, dicuntque ea per se mortua fuisse. Ita fictas habent conscientias, et in aliis suis observantiis, sicut et in hoc existimari potest, quia scilicet veritatem deserentes, falsis se figmentis illudunt. Nullum est, secundum eos, purgatorium. Omnes autem morientes statim vel in coelum vel in infernum transunt: ideoque et suffragia ab Ecclesia facta pro defunctis, nihil eis prodesse affirmant, cum in coelo non idigeant, et in infemo nullatenus adjuventur. Unde colligunt oblationes pro defunctis factas Clericis qui illas comedunt prodesse, non animabus quæ hujusmodi non*

utuntur. Illorum dogma est, sanctos in coelo orationes fidelium non audire, neque venemtionones, quibus eos honoramus, attendere; quia cum corpora sanctorum hic mortua jaceant, et spiritus tam remoti sint in coelo, orationes nostras nullo modo auditu percipere valeant vel visu. Adunt et sanctos non orare pro nobis, et ob id suffragia illorum non esse imploranda a nobis, quoniam coelesti gudio absorpti, nobis intendere, aut quid aliud curare non possunt. Unde et solemnitates, quas in sanctorum venemtionone facimus, irrident, et alia quibus eos venemmur. In diebus autem festis (ubi possunt) occulte operantur, arguentes, quod cum opemri bonum sit, bona agere in die festo malum non est. In Quadragesima, et die jejuniorum Ecclesiae, non jejulant, sed comes comedunt, ubi audent, dicentes, quod Deus non delectetur in afflictionibus amicorum suorum, cum sine his potens sit eos salvare. Quidam autem hacritici affligunt se jejuniis, vigiliis, et hujusmodi, quia sine talibus sanctitatis nomen apud simplices acquirere non possunt, nec eos simulationis figmento dicipere. Vetus Testamentum non habent vel recipiunt, sed Evangelia, ut per ea non impugnentur, et se defendant, dicentes, quod superveniente Evangelio, vetem omnia sing abjicienda. Sic et verba Sanctorum Augustini, Jovini, Gregorii, Chrisostimi, Isidori et auctoritates eorum truncatas decerpunt, ut per ea sua figmenta approbent, aut resistant, vel etiam simplices secuncant facilius, pulchris sanctorum sententiis doctrinam sacrilegam colorantes. Illas autem sanctorum sentias, quas sibi vident contrarias, quibusque error eorum destruitur, tacite practermittunt. Dociles, inter alios complices et facundos, docent verba Evangelii dictaque Apostolorum et aliorum sanctorum in vulgari lingua corde formare, ut sciant et alios informare, et fideles allicere, ac demum suam sectam pulchris sanctorum verbis polire, quo salubria putentur quae persuadent: et ita per dulces sermones seducant corda innocentum. Non solum viri, sed et foeminac eorum apud eos docent, quia foeminis magis patet accessus ad foeminas pervertendas, ut per eas etiam viros ipsos subvertant, sicut per Evam serpens illudit Adam. Verbis coopertis loqui docent, ne pro veritate studeant loqui mendacium; ut cum de uno requiruntur, de alio oblique respondeant, et ita auditores versute deludant, pracsertim ubi per confessionem veritatis errorem suum timent deprehendi. Eadem simulatione ecclesias nobiscum frequentant, intersunt divinis, offerunt ad altare, sacramenta percipiunt, confitentur Sacerdotibus, observant Ecclesiae jejunia, festa colunt, ac Sacerdotum benedictiones inclinato capite suscipiunt: quamvis haec omnia, et similia ecclesiasticac institutionis statuta irrideant, et profana judicent et damnosa. Aiunt sufficecere ad salutem soli Deo, et non homini confiteri. Et eos qui sanctis offerunt luminaria derident. Diende sequitur in eodem libro: Incoepit autem haec secta circa annum ab incamatione Domini 1170. Sub Joanne Bellomains, Archiepiscopo Lugdunensi. Hacc sunt, candide lector, quae ex antiquo libro membraneo, manuque ante ducentos nonaginta sex annos per pracsdictum fratrem Raynerium conscripto, fideliter transcripsimus. Ex quibus videre est hanc Valdensium sectam, et praccipuas, peneque omnes (quae nunc vigent) hacresis, non recenter inventas fuisse, sed eas ante trecentos septuaginta sex annos venisse in usum. Quarum autores postea (ut sequitur) damnati fuerunt.

"This was their first error, **a contempt of ecclesiastical power**: and from thence they have been delivered up to Satan, and by him cast headlong into innumerable errors, mixing the erroneous doctrines of the heretics of old with their own inventions. And being cast out of the Catholic Church, they affirm that they alone are the Church of Christ, and his disciples. They declare themselves to be the Apostles' successors, to have apostolical authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. **They hold the Church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon**, and that all that obey her are damned, especially the Clergy that are subject to her since the time of Pope Sylvester. They deny that any true miracles are wrought in the Church, because none of them did ever work any. **They hold that none of the ordinances of the Church, that have been introduced since Christ's ascension, ought to be observed**, as being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the Church, and the like, they utterly reject. They speak against consecrated churches, churchyards, and other things of like nature; declaring that they were the inventions of covetous Priests, to increase their gains by spunging the people by this means of their money and oblations. **THEY SAY, THAT THEN FIRST A MAN IS BAPTIZED, WHEN HE IS RECEIVED INTO THEIR SECT. SOME OF THEM HOLD, THAT BAPTISM IS OF NO ADVANTAGE TO INFANTS, BECAUSE THEY CANNOT ACTUALLY BELIEVE**. They reject the sacrament of Confirmation; but, instead of that sacrament, their teachers lay their hands upon their disciples. They say, that the Bishops, the Clergy, and other religious, are no better than Scribes and Pharisees, and persecutors of the Apostles. **They do not believe the body and blood of Christ to be the true sacrament, but only blessed bread, which by a figure only is called the body of Christ**, in like manner as it is said, and the rock was Christ, and such like. Some of them hold that this sacrament can only be celebrated by those that are good; others again, by any that know the words of consecration. This sacrament they celebrate in their assemblies, repeating the words of the Gospel at their table, and participating together, in imitation of Christ's Supper. **They say, that a Priest that is a sinner cannot bind or loose any one, as being**

himself bound: and that any good and knowing layman may absolve another, and impose penance. **They reject extreme Unction,** declaring it to be rather a curse than a sacrament. Marriage, say they, is nothing else but sworn fornication, except the parties live continently; and account any filthiness more lawful than conjugal copulation. [This section is doubtless a slander, because in other places the Catholic inquisitors acknowledged that the Waldenses were the most morally pure Christians of that age. D.W. Cloud] They praise continence indeed, but in the mean time give way to the satisfying of burning lust by any filthy means whatsoever, expounding that place of the Apostle, it is better to marry than to burn, thus, that it is better to satisfy one's lust by any filthy art, than to be tempted therewith in the heart. But this they conceal as much as possible, that they may not be reproached therewith. If any honest woman amongst them, that has the repute of chastity, is brought to bed of a child, they carefully conceal it, and send it abroad to be nursed, that it may not be known. They hold all oaths to be unlawful, and a mortal sin: yet they dispense with them, when it is done to avoid death, lest they should betray their complices, or the secret of their infidelity. They hold it to be an unpardonable sin to betray an heretick, and the very sin against the Holy Ghost. They say, that malefactors ought not to be put to death by the secular power. [What they actually believed is that the secular authorities should not persecute for matters of conscience. D.W. Cloud] Some of them hold it unlawful to kill brute animals, as fishes, or the like; but when they have a mind to eat them, they hang them over the fire or smoke till they die. Fleas and such sort of insects they shake off their clothes, or else dip their clothes in hot water, supposing them thus to be dead of themselves. [This section is another slander. At least the vast majority of the Waldenses kept ate the meat of animals and fish.] Thus they cheat their own consciences in this and other observances. From whence we may see, that having forsaken truth, they deceive themselves with their own false notions. **According to them there is no purgatory;** and all that die do immediately pass either into heaven or hell. That **therefore the prayers of the Church for the dead are of no use, because those that are in heaven do not want them, neither can those that are in hell be relieved by them.** And from hence they infer, that the offerings that are made for the dead are only of use to the Clergymen that eat them, and not to the deceased, who cannot be profited by them. **They hold, that the saints in heaven do not hear the prayers of the faithful, or regard the honors which are done to them;** because their bodies lie dead here beneath, and their spirits are at so great a distance from us in heaven, that they can neither hear our prayers, nor see the honors which we pay them. **They add, that the saints do not pray for us,** and that therefore we are to entreat their intercession, because, being swallowed up with heavenly joy, they cannot attend to us, or indeed to any thing else. Wherefore also they deride all the festivals which we celebrate in honor of the saints, and all other instances of our veneration for them. Accordingly, wherever they can do it, they secretly work upon holydays; arguing, that since working is good, it cannot be evil to do that which is good on a holyday. They do not observe Lent or other fasts of the Church; alleging, that God does not delight in the afflictions of his friends, as being able to save without them. Some heretics indeed afflict themselves with fastings, watchings, and the like; because without these they cannot obtain the reputation of holiness amongst the simple people, nor deceive them by their reigned hypocrisy. They do not receive the Old Testament; but the Gospel only, that they may not be overthrown by it, but rather be able to defend themselves therewith; pretending, that upon the coming of the Gospel, all old things are to be laid aside. In like manner they pick up the clipt words and authorities of the holy Fathers, Augustin, Ieronymus, Gregory, Chrysostome, and Isidore, that with them they may support their opinions, oppose others, or the more easily seduce the simple, by coloring over their sacrilegious doctrine with the good sentences of the saints; but at the same time they very quietly pass those places in the holy Fathers, which oppose and destroy their errors. Those who are teachable and eloquent amongst them, they instruct to get the words of the Gospel, as well as the sayings of the Apostles and other saints, by heart, that they may be able to inform others, and draw in believers, and beautify their sect with goodly words of the saints; that the things they persuade and recommend may be thought to be sound and saving: thus by their sweet discourses deceiving the hearts of the innocent. Neither do the men only, but the women also teach amongst them; because women have an easier access to those of their own sex to pervert them, that afterwards by their means the men may be perverted also; as the serpent deceived Adam by Eve's means. They teach their disciples to speak in hid and dark words, and instead of speaking truth, to endeavour to speak lies: that when they are asked about one thing, they might perversely answer about another, and thus craftily deceive their hearers, especially when they fear that by confessing the truth they should discover their errors. In the same dissembling manner they frequent our churches, are present at divine service, offer at the altar, receive the sacraments, confess to the Priests, observe the Church fasts, celebrate festivals, and receive the Priest's blessings, reverently bowing their heads; though in the mean time they scoff at all these institutions of the Church, and look upon them as profane and hurtful. **They say it is sufficient to salvation to confess to God**

alone, and not to man. After this, it follows in the same book: Now this sect began about the year of our Lord's incarnation 1170, under John Bellomains, Archbishop of Lyons.

"This is that, courteous reader, which I have transcribed out of an old MS. parchment book, written 296 years ago by Friar Rainerius. From whence it appears, that this sect of the Waldenses, and the chief, yea, almost all heresies, which are now in vogue, are not of late invention, but have continued already above 376 years [Coussord was writing in 1548]. Whose authors afterwards (as appears in the sequel) were condemned."

Ivonet, in his *Summa*, part. 2: cap. 2. accuseth them of above thirty errors, as we find it recorded by Pegna upon the *Directory of the Inquisitors*, page 280.

Aeneas Sylvius, who flourished in the year 1451, makes a vast catalog of them, in his original of those of Bohemia, who we know were a colony of the Waldenses, cap. 35.

Emerieus, who lived in 1370, in his *Directory*, sets down a list of twenty errors of the Waldenses, part 2:q. 14. p. 278.

We find the same in Bernard of Luxemburg, who lived about the year 1520, Poce Pauperes de Lugduno et Paterini, and in Alphonsus de Castro, who lived in 1530.

Claudius Coussord, in the year 1548, sets down an extract of Raynerius, in *Summa de Catharis et Leonistis*; and he follows his text, in his confutation of the Waldenses and Protestants, as being almost the same.

So Albertus Cataneus represents the errors of the Waldenses, as agreeable to our opinions. Hist. Caroli 8. p. 291 ad 296.

Thus I have given, methinks, a sufficient number of witnesses, succeeding one another for five hundred years together, who all unanimously deposed, that the Waldenses were looked upon as heretics.

And yet notwithstanding all this, the Bishop of Meaux stiffly maintains, that the Waldenses never espoused the opinions of the Protestants, till after the year 1532, at which time they united themselves with them against the Church of Rome. Was there ever a more obstinate piece of illusion? Claudius Seysselius, Archbishop of Turin, wrote against the Waldenses before the year 1518. He began his pontificate by persecuting them according to the edicts of Francis I. and Charles Duke of Savoy. His book was printed at Paris, in the year 1520, in the first pages of which book he gives us an account of the sequel of their continual persecutions; he sets down their belief, which is almost wholly conformable to their confession of faith in 1532; and yet the Bishop will needs still confidently maintain, that all that Confession was only the fruit of their uniting with the Protestants.

But however, the Bishop tells us, that they did believe transubstantiation, and so they cannot be looked upon as schismatics, such as formerly were the Donatists. The monster of transubstantiation is so dear to the Romish party, that it goes very hard with them to disown those that own that. It seems as if at this day it was the mark of Christianity. Be accused of the worst of errors, yet if you do only believe transubstantiation, you shall only pass for a schismatic. Garnerius, the Jesuit, makes it as great a crime in Nestorius, that he denied transubstantiation, as he pretends he did, as if he had overthrown the mystery of the incarnation: and thus the Bishop of Meaux seems only to consider the Waldenses as schismatics, because, as he saith, they owned that doctrine. However, we shall find that it will be very difficult for the Bishop to make out this his assertion by such proofs as may be able to satisfy his reader.

First, **What has he to say against that multitude of witnesses of his own communion, who so plainly assert, that they rejected transubstantiation?** I have but just now set down the passages themselves. If he accuse them of having suffered themselves to be deceived in so important an article, what

credit can their testimonies deserve, when they form against them such horrid accusations upon other points? Truly we are obliged to the Bishop for furnishing us with so good an answer, and we want only his ingenuity to make use of it upon occasion.

Secondly, **What can the Bishop say to the confessions of faith of the Waldenses, wherein they formally reject this doctrine.**

The Bishop here offers two things which swayed him, so easy is he to be determined by appearances. The one is, that it appears from the first conferences that were held with the Waldenses, as that of Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, that they did not reject transubstantiation, because no mention is made of it throughout the whole dispute, which the said Bernard has penned very exactly. This he confirms by several trials of the Waldenses, whereof the proceedings are in Mr. Colbert's library. The other is, that it seems very probable, that the Confession of Faith, printed in the History of Perrin, is a late thing, and drawn up since the reformation.

Nothing can be more impertinent than these answers. If this way of arguing be good, it must follow, either that the Waldenses have changed their belief since Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, that is since the end of the twelfth century, until the year 1250, or that Raynerius was a mere slanderer.

It must also follow, that the Inquisitors that examined them about this article, as about an article which the Waldenses constantly rejected, were very knaves, or blockheads who understood nothing of the business of the Inquisition.

But to speak freely, the Inquisitors deserve but small credit, if they speak otherwise than their Directory adviseth, which they are to follow, as the lesson that is given them, for their direction in the exercise of their office: and I shall make it appear, as I go on, by giving a scantling of their honesty and fair dealing, how little cause the Bishop had to rely upon them.

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the state of the Church of Rome at the time the separation of the Paterines or Waldenses; together with the accusations charged upon them by the said Church, and the idea they had conceived of her

The account I have but now given from Raynerius and other authors, who have made a catalogue of the errors of the Waldenses, is abundantly sufficient to refute the vain pretense of the Bishop of Meaux, who supposeth that the Waldenses were only schismatics. But forasmuch as it is not unlikely but the Papists will disown the Bishop in this particular, as well as they do in so many others, it is but natural to endeavor to obviate the objections they may frame against the Churches of Piedmont.

1. They will probably allege, that the Patarines never accused the Church of Rome of so great a number of errors as the Waldenses do.

2. They may say, that the Waldenses. were really guilty of a multitude of errors and heresies, which the authors that I have cited after Raynerius do unanimously charge them with.

3. They may probably take notice, that the Waldenses had an article in their belief, whereof we find no mention made in the reasons alleged by the Patarines in justification of their separating from the Church of Rome, viz. that the Waldenses declared the Pope to be antichrist, and the Church of Rome the whore of Babylon, spoken of in the Revelation, which does not appear to have been any part of the Patarines belief.

It will be an easy matter to satisfy any reasonable person about the first of these objections: and to this purpose it will be of importance to consider, what was the state of the Romish Church at the time when a part of the diocese of Milan, with diverse Bishops at the head of them, were obliged to separate themselves from it. There is a foolish persuasion entertained by the generality of those of the Romish communion, that their Church has ever continued in the same state; whence they naturally infer, as the Bishop of Meaux does, that since the Patarines or Waldenses did not at first reject all those doctrines of the Church of Rome, which in their later Confessions they have condemned; it may well be supposed they owned and professed the same with that Church. **How gross a delusion this is, will be easily made out by manifesting that the Church of Rome, ever since the time of this separation, has declined from bad to worse, and that the reason why the Waldenses did not at first oppose all those doctrines which we at this day reject, was because they were not as yet hatched, a great part of them being beholden to the subtilty of the School men for their original, who were not in being at the time of their separation; or because the said doctrines were not looked upon by the Church of Rome to be essential, as necessarily to require the profession or practice of them from those of her communion.**

The state of the Church of Rome, with reference to her faith concerning the articles about which we contest with her at this day, will appear from the following particulars.

1. She did not impose a necessity of equalizing the authority of the Apocrypha with the canonical books of Scripture. This incontestably appears from the testimony of all her own authors that have been since the eleventh century, to the Council of Trent, which first imposed it. Accordingly we find the same distinction we make of apocryphal and canonical books, in the writings of Radulphus Giselbertus, Rupertus, Honorius Augustod. Peter, Abbot of Clugny, against the Petrobus. Hugo de Saneto Vietore, Richardus de Saneto Vietore, Petrus Comestor, Cardinal Hugo, Nicolaus de Lyra, Brito the Franciscan, Thomas Aquinas, Joannes Semeca, Ocham, Hervmus, St. Antoninus, Tostatus, Dionysius the Carthusian, Cardinal Ximenes, Cardinal Cajetan, Josse Clithou, and in the writings of all those who placed the *Prologus Galeatus* of St. Jerome before the Bible, though in divers copies the word *Hagiographi* was not instead of *Apocryphi*, which word St. Jerome had attributed to authors whose authority we reject, as some Papists have observed in their editions.

The Church of Rome did not believe that tradition was a sufficient ground to build articles of faith on, though the second Council of Nice supposed it was only to maintain the worship of idols, as appears from the account Thomas Aquinas has given us.

At that time indeed all the faith necessary to be believed by a Christian was reduced to the Apostles' Creed; Leo X. being the first who determined that the Popes had power to make new articles of faith, as well as a new rule of manners. In bulla Exurge.

The reading of the Scripture was not forbid to laymen until the year 1200. Innocent III. Epist. ad Metenses.

Councils were not believed to be infallible, though the Popes presided in them. The history of the ages succeeding the tenth century are filled with examples that put this out of doubt. To this purpose the reader may consult the treatise concerning the *Unity of the Church*, written by Venericus, Bishop of Verceil, the works of Ocham upon the deposition of the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, of Peter d'Ailly, Aeneas Sylvius, and of many others; which will fully convince him of the truth I assert.

It was not believed that the Christians did merit any thing by their good works, but persons on their death-beds were obliged formally to profess the contrary, in their last or death-bed confessions, as appears by the form prescribed to that purpose by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Indulgences, which came into request some time after the separation of the diocese of Milan, were looked upon only as pious frauds. This was the notion Petrus Cantor gave of them; and it is apparent, that till the fourteenth century, that which at present is owned to be the ground of them, was rejected. Jubilees were never heard of until the time of Pope Boniface VIII. that is to say, in the year 1300.

It was not believed, that notwithstanding preceding contrition, absolution was necessarily required, to obtain remission of sins; but on the contrary, that contrition for sin was sufficient to restore the sinner to a state of grace.

It was not believed, that St. James, in the fifth chapter of his Epistle, speaks of auricular confession; neither indeed was there any use of confession, except in public penances, which by little and little began to wear out of use after the twelfth century. And the necessity of confessing once a year was not imposed till the year 1215, by Pope Innocent III.

Neither was the necessity of the Priest's intention believed at that time, as appears from the writings of Adelman of Brixia against Berengarius, as well as by those of Petrus Damianus and many others.

It was not believed that marriage was forbid to Priests, otherwise than only by human constitutions; as may be seen in the common canon law of Gratian.

The sacrament of the Eucharist was not believed to be .an object of adoration. We find nothing of it in all Berengarius's disputation: we read also, that Henry II. King of England, adored the cross on his death-bed, and that he received the Eucharist with reverence, but not a word of his worshipping of it. And indeed the decree whereby its adoration was enjoined, is of no longer standing than the thirteenth century. And even to this day the Deacon communicates standing, according to the ancient custom of the Greek and Latin Churches.

It was not believed, that the end and aim of the real presence was to offer up Jesus Christ in sacrifice to God, for the sins of the living and dead: Lombard, and the greatest part of the old Schoolmen, owning it to be no more than a commemoration.

At that time there were but very few Churches where they began to communicate under one kind only, viz. that of bread; neither was this castore authorized but by the Council of Constance in the year 1415, till

which time almost all the reflections of Papists upon the two kinds are contrary to this abuse, which Henricus Gandavensis so highly exclaims against.

It is but since the tenth age that they began to place images on the altars, and indeed a good while after; and that in some Churches only. It is but since Lewis the IXth's time that the consecration of images was brought in use, as may still be seen in the Pontifical. Gaudidus de Bello loco de vita Ludovic. IX. c. 36.

It is but since the tenth century, that the cross hath been set upon altars; and we find no instance to make us believe that the image of Jesus Christ was at that time fastened to it, as it is at this day. Thiers, c. 18.

The Office of the Virgin was not established in the western Church till the year 1195, by Pope Urban II. at Clermont, in a council assembled there by him, as having been till then the effect only of a private or particular superstition.

Before the twelfth century, very few foundations of dirges or masses for the dead were heard of; but since that time the Mendicant Friars have brought into vogue the Office for the Dead, vowed masses, and dirges or masses for the deceased, and have multiplied them to that excess, that it is impossible for them to satisfy the obligations they take upon them of saying so many masses.

For the multiplication of new festivals of the saints we are beholden to the fifteenth century, as may be seen in Clamengis, lib. De novis Festivitat. non instituendis.

The confraternities are but a very late invention, as M. Thiers owns, p. 33. of his Dissertation concerning the quire of churches.

These are the articles that were either wholly unknown, or not yet received in the Church of Rome; whence it is evident, that the Patarines or Waldenses could not at first oppose them, and that it is no matter of wonder that they never set themselves against them, but as from time to time they were admitted of by the Church of Rome, whose corruptions increased daily; which they take notice of in their last confessions of faith. The great controversies therefore at that time were these:

1. Whether the ministry of the Church of Rome was a lawful ministry, forasmuch as simony was the principal means of obtaining any ecclesiastical dignities in the western Church.
2. Whether it was necessary to be subject to the Pope, in order to be a member of the true Church; which the Popes absolutely pretended, having to that end invaded the authority of almost all Metropolitans, that naturally were *autocephali*, that is, subject to no Church-authority above themselves out of their diocese.
3. Whether the Popes had power to annul the ministry of the married Clergy.
4. Whether the worshipping of the saints, relics, images, and of the cross, were lawful.
5. Whether the belief of the Popes concerning the carnal presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist was a belief founded upon holy Scripture.
6. Whether the belief of the absolute necessity of Baptism was lawful.
7. Whether the doctrine of purgatory was evangelical.
8. Whether prayers for the dead were a religious performance.

[Note by D.W. Cloud, Director, Way of Life Literature, attached to the Way of Life Literature edition of Allix's *Remarks upon the Churches of Piedmont*, 2000: Peter Allix could have added another important controversy against Rome in the last few hundred years of the first millennium, and that was that against the heresy of infant baptism, which began to be incorporated into apostate churches during the third century and became a widespread practice by the fifth century. See Baptist histories by Armitage, Jones, Benedict, Orchard, etc. Allix was an Anglican and did not acknowledge the error of infant baptism. The aforementioned Baptist historians have proven beyond doubt that many Waldensian churches rejected infant baptism and practiced believer's baptism.]

Now, if we will take the pains to examine a little the questions that were agitated between the Waldenses and the Church of Rome, we shall find them to be the very same with those I have just now mentioned; except only, as I have before observed, that the said questions were afterwards multiplied proportionably to the increase of the Romish corruptions.

As to what concerns the calumnies wherewith some have endeavored to disfigure them, and to make them the horror and detestation of people, we may truly aver, that in this particular the Church of Rome has only consulted her passion and hatred, without the least regard had to truth, or their innocence.

The learned Usher, and diverse others have placed the innocence of the Waldenses in so clear a light, as to all the matters whereof they are accused, that I should abuse the patience of my reader, by endeavoring anew to make their apology. It shall suffice therefore to observe first, that **the Doctors of the Romish Church have maliciously affected to fasten upon the Waldenses the belief of the Manichees, under pretense that the Manichees also opposed some of the Romish practices, as well as the Waldenses.** Secondly, that to this purpose they have attributed to the Manichees several doctrines of the Waldenses, which do not in the least partake with Manicheism. This a judicious reader may easily perceive, by comparing the catalogue of the errors of the new Manichees, drawn up by Emericus, which I have set down in chapter 15 with their opinions, as they are reported to us by St. Epiphanius, St. Austin, Theodoret, and by Peter of Sicily, in the ninth century.

I acknowledge, it may seem strange to some, to find the Waldenses so constantly charged with such gross calumnies; but here I must desire the reader to consider,

1. That it is no great sin with the Church of Rome to spread lies concerning those that are enemies of the faith.
2. That the Church of Rome has been always desirous of preserving the reputation of her ancient authors, as being some of their greatest saints, which would visibly have been diminished, if not quite lost, in case their successors should have owned the innocence of the Vaudois Churches. No, it is a far more easy and convenient way to assert, that the Waldenses have changed their belief, than to accuse their saints of having been most infamous calumniators.
3. That the greatest part of those authors who have writ concerning the heresies of the Waldenses or Vaudois, have only followed their first leaders, viz. Alanus and others, without troubling themselves to inquire into the truth of the matter: which is the very character of those sort of compilers.
4. That after the account Emericus has given us in his *Directory of the Inquisitors*, they of the Church of Rome were no longer at liberty to embrace a different representation of their belief from what he had already given; people generally being so far engaged in an high esteem for the Inquisition, and their exactness in all proceedings, that they would have looked upon it as a great crime to change their judgment in a matter they had allowed of and established: neither indeed could it be done, without incurring the danger of falling into their hands; for we may well suppose they would never suffer their credit and sincerity to be in the least questioned.
5. That **there is nothing more common with the Romish party, than to make use of the most horrid calumnies to blacken and expose those who have renounced her communion.** The Protestants in France were at first accused of committing the same impurities at their meetings, which the heathens

objected to the primitive Christians, and the Papists since that to the Waldenses. And if we cast an eye upon what Sigebert tells us concerning the Greeks of the eleventh century, we shall find that calumny is a trade the Romish party is perfectly well versed in. Leo IX. saith he, sent his Legates to Constantinople, to refute the heresies of the Greeks, who, like Simoniacs, sold the gift of God; like the Valesians, took their guests, and gelt them, and so promoted them to bishoprics; like the Arians, they rebaptized the Latins, that had already been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity; in imitation of the Donatists, they boasted the orthodox Church to be only in Greece; like the Nicolaitans, they allowed marriage to Priests; like the Severians, they declared the Law of Moses to be accursed; like the Pneumatomachi, they cut off the belief of the Holy Ghost from the Creed; like the Nazarenes, they observed Judaism, forbidding little children, though at the point of death, to be baptized before the eighth day; and women in danger of life, by reason of their travail or courses, to communicate; or, if they were heathens, to be baptized: that they called the Latins Azymitae, and persecuting them, shut up their churches; that they sacrificed with leavened bread, and anathematized the Roman Church in her children, preferring the Constantinopolitan Church before her. But notwithstanding all this, if we will believe Leo Allatius, there was but a very little difference between the Roman and Greek Church at that time.

6. We are to take notice, that notwithstanding the fury and malice of the Romish party in wounding the reputation of the Vaudois, yet there have not been wanting some historians, in the bosom of that Church, who have been so generous as to own the truth. Paradin observes, in his *Annals of Burgundy*, that he had seen ancient histories that fully justified them from all the accusations laid to their charge, and made it appear, that their only crime was their declaiming against the profligate manners and conduct of the Roman Clergy. Thuanus has seconded him herein, as well as divers other authors of the Roman communion, who have wrote since the Reformation, and sufficiently acquitted them of all those horrid calumnies which for so long a time have been made use of to run them down.

I proceed now to the last article before mentioned, viz. the idea which the Vaudois had conceived of the Church of Rome: certainly it is a very surprising thing to see the Vaudois treating the Pope with the title of Antichrist, and of the Apocalyptical Beast, and the Church of Rome with that of the Great Whore, and Mystical Babylon. What ground had they to speak and write at this rate? for we find that this was the common style they made use of in their disputes with the Romish party. This is a matter well worth our consideration.

Emerick, in his *Directory*, attributes this opinion to those he calls the new Manichees: but to speak truth, he is wholly besides the matter, and either abuseth himself, or has a mind to deceive others; for it was the opinion of the Vaudois, and not of the Manichees: and they had the strongest motives so to do, that persons who made it their chief business to read the Scripture, could propose to themselves; motives, I say, which from time to time were fortified and confirmed by the continual increase of the corruptions of the Church of Rome.

1. There have not been wanting a great number, in the bosom of the Church of Rome, who conceived and publicly proposed this notion, since the time of Gregory VII. Wolffus has set down several of their writings on this subject, which it is not necessary to transcribe here.

2. We find that the Vaudois had with great exactness applied themselves to the study of the Revelation; and the treatise they have published about this matter, long time before the Reformation, sufficiently evidenceth that they had compared the characters St. John speaks of with those which they found in the Pope and his Church.

3. We find that in the said treatise they make a more particular reflection upon **three things which stared in the eyes of all men since the twelfth century: the first was the idolatry of the Church of Rome; the other was the power the Popes had usurped over almost all the secular powers of Europe; and the third was the fury and violence of the persecution the Church of Rome employed to support her tyranny**, her false doctrine and worship, and to crush whatsoever did in the least offer to oppose itself against her usurgation.

1. The idolatry of the Church of Rome, which had suffered a great shock at the Council of Francfort in 794, but notwithstanding that still increased every day, and more especially after that the darkness of the tenth

century had forced piety to give way to idolatry and superstition. The violation of the second Commandment was very apparent, but could be no longer palliated or disguised after that some Popes in the twelfth century began to renew in their canonizations, which began about that time, the pattern of the Pagan apotheoses. This deification of men is so horrid an attempt against the Christian religion, that it may well be looked upon as the top and highest degree of idolatry.

2. The method the Popes took to make themselves masters of all Europe, almost all the kings thereof subjecting their crowns to the Pontifical mitre. They who will take the pains to consult the Annals of Baronius about this point, will find, that scarcely was there so much as one state left in Europe, which had not declared itself the Pope's vassal before the year 1200. He endeavors to confirm this truth by the public acts he produceth concerning the kingdom of Arragon, Portugal, Castile, and all Spain, as also of Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and the other provinces of Italy, of Provence, Low Britany, and whole France, of Denmark, Saxony, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Museovia, England, and Ireland. Hereupon we may make this obvious and natural reflection: the Christians allege against the Jews a very convincing argument. It was foretold of old, that the Messiah was to convert the nations to the worship of the God of Israel: this being accordingly accomplished by Jesus Christ, it follows that he indeed is the Messiah, to whom this character is given by the ancient oracles; and by an argument *a pari* we infer thus: the kings that were to succeed to the ruins of the Roman empire have given their kingdoms to the Pope; wherefore the Pope must needs be he whom St. John has marked out to us by the beast, to whom the kings were to submit their authority. Now, as the Jews must make all Christians to renounce the God of Israel, whom they own and acknowledge, before they can suppose that the Messiah is to convert all the heathens, and be known to be the Messiah by this distinguishing character; in like manner must the Papists snatch out of the Pope's hands all the kingdoms that he hath, and doth possess, at least, as lord paramount, in order to make way for the appearance of Antichrist, and for his being owned to be such.

3. The violence of the persecution she has managed throughout all the parts of Europe, and whereof the poor Vaudois always met with the greatest share the Popes, who had enslaved to themselves all the western Churches, being masters of the temporal also, by the voluntary subjection of its emperors and princes, did no longer think of keeping any measures. The Bishops being almost generally subject to them, they made them decide in their synods whatsoever they pleased. The new laws they made were only the fruit of their humours and interest; and the princes being now become their vassals, were the ready executioners of the Papal violence and fury against those they had anathematized.

Now it is certain, first, that since the tenth century, wherein Arnulphus, Bishop of Orleans, called the Pope Antichrist, in a full Council at Rheims, nothing has been more ordinary than to give him this title. The Antipopes of the eleventh century very lavishly bestowed it upon one another. This example was followed in the twelfth century, and has never since been discontinued till the time of the Reformation; a vast number of writers having set themselves against the Pope and the Papacy, openly proclaiming him to be the Antichrist, and his Church the Great Whore, and Mystical Babylon. Baleus takes notice of a great number of these in his *Centuries*, with reference to England; and Wolffus hath instanced in many others belonging to the other parts of the western empire: more especially we ought to take notice of what Rupertus, Abbot of Tuits, tells us, in his *Commentary upon the Apocalypse*, that cruelty and persecution were one of the most express characters of Antichrist. See here what he writ at the beginning of the twelfth century, upon these words of the Apocalypse, find cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be put to death. *Ira Christus non facit; neque Prophetce ejus, neque Apostoli docuerunt, neque reges Christiani jam facti hoc acceperunt, ut occiderent, et sanguine cumulandum existiment Christi servitium; vevus namque Deus non coacta sed spontanea servitia vult. Ergo et in hoc, in hoc maxime palam faciet sensum habentibus, fuod vere sit Antichristus, quod vere non Christus, sed secundum nomen suum Christo sit contrarius. Hic est Christus qui sanguinem suum fundit; hic est Antichristus qui sanguinem fundit alienum.* In Apoc. lib. 3. cap. 13.

"Christ does not do so, neither did his Prophets or Apostles teach so, neither have the kings that are Christians received any such instructions to kill men, or to make them think that the worship of Christ is to be stained with blood; for the true God doth not desire any forced, but voluntary service. Wherefore by this mark especially will he make it evident to all that have any understanding, that indeed he is the Antichrist; that indeed he is not Christ, but, according to his name, opposite and contrary to Christ. He is Christ that sheds his own blood, he is Antichrist that sheds the blood of others."

After all this, I leave it to any one to judge, whether it were an easy matter for the Patarines and Vaudois, being oppressed by the Pope and his instruments at the rate they were, not to form this idea of the Pope and his Church; and whether any can think it possible, they should not instruct their descendants to have that just horror for the Church of Rome, which has always hindered them from reuniting with her, notwithstanding all the ways of violence she has made use of to oblige them to it.

CHAPTER 22

Concerning the belief and conduct of the Waldenses in Bohemia

Now, because the Waldenses being driven into Bohemia, have continued there several years, it is but reasonable for us with some attention to take a view of the state of those Churches. This, as on the one hand it will give us a just idea of the purity of that spring from whence this rivulet was supplied with water; so on the other hand, it will be useful to clear them from those calumnies wherewith the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to overwhelm them, in his treatise concerning the Protestant variations. An equitable reader will be able to make his judgment from hence, whether the Protestants have any reason to be ashamed to own the ancient Waldenses to be their predecessors; and whether the Church of Rome did well in rejecting and despising the advices and remonstrances of these their censors.

We have two famous authors, who can inform us concerning the faith and conversation of the Waldenses in Bohemia; the one is an Inquisitor, who wrote in the fourteenth century, towards the end of it, "Who," saith he, "had an exact knowledge of the Waldenses," at whose trials he had often assisted; and that in several countries, as himself witnesseth.

The other is **Aeneas Sylvius**, who came to be Pope Pius II. in his *History of Bohemia*, chap. 35; where he gives us an exact description of them, as having been himself on the place, and had several conferences with them, and desiring to inform a Cardinal concerning them.

The first of these has **borrowed a good part of Raynerus's treatise**, who wrote in Lombardy about the year 1250; which shows, that they had the same opinions at the end of the fourteenth century, which their ancestors had in Lombardy about the middle of the thirteenth. The thing that is singular in this author is this, not only that he prosecutes the same way of calumniating them upon many heads, which is the way of Inquisitors against pretended heretics, but that he hath annexed to every article of the Waldensian opinions, concerning the doctrines or practices of the Church of Rome, the occasion that induced them to embrace such opinions; which is a thing well worth our consideration, since we shall learn hereby, that the Waldenses had very exactly considered and weighed the doctrines and practices of that Church. I am resolved to lay down these their opinions; for as the proofs which the good Inquisitor allegeth to defend the opinions of his Church, they are for the most part so extravagant, that the meanest polemical writer of this age amongst Papists would think it an affront to his own judgment to make use of them.

The first general head of the errors of the Waldenses is said to be of their blasphemies against the Church of Rome, her practice, statutes, and her whole Clergy. Their errors (saith he) are distinguished into three parts; the first is, of their blasphemies, wherewith they blaspheme the Church of Rome, her practice, laws, and whole Clergy. The second part of their errors is about the Sacraments of the Church, and the saints. The third part is concerning their abhorreny of all the good and laudable customs of the Church.

Their first error, which comes under the first general head, is,

"That the Church of Rome is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but an assembly of ungodly men; and that she has ceased from being the true Church from the time of Pope Sylvester, at which time the poison of temporal advantages was east into the Church.

2. "That all vices and sins reign in that Church; and that they alone live righteously.

3. "That there is scarce any one to be found in the Church, that lives according to the Gospel rule besides themselves.

4. "That they are the true poor in spirit, who suffer persecution for the faith, and righteousness sake.
5. "That they are the true Church of Christ.
6. "That the eastern Church doth not value or regard the Church of Rome; and that **the Church of Rome is the whore in the Revelation.**
7. "They despise and reject all ordinances and statutes of the Church, as being too many, and very burdensome.
8. "That **the Pope is the head and captain of all error.**
9. "That the Prelates are the Scribes, and seeming religious Pharisees.
10. "That **the Pope and all his Bishops are murderers by reason of the wars they foment.**
11. "That we must not obey Prelates, but God alone. Acts 4.
12. "That none in the Church ought to be greater than any of their brethren, according to that of St. Matthew, But ye are all brethren.
13. "That no man ought to kneel to a Priest; Revelation the angel saith to St. John, See thou do it not.
14. "That tithes are not to be given to Priests, because there was no use of them in the primitive Church.
15. "That the Clergy ought not to enjoy any temporal possessions. Deuteronomy Neither the priest, nor any of the tribe of Levi, shall have any inheritance with the children of Israel, the sacrifices being their portion.
16. "That neither the Clergy nor Religious ought to enjoy any prebends.
17. "That the Bishops and Abbots ought not to enjoy any regalia.
18. "That neither the land nor people ought to be divided into parishes.
19. "That it is an evil thing to endow and found churches and monasteries; and that nothing ought to be left to churches by will; that there ought to be none a tenant to the Church. And they condemn all the Clergy for their idleness, telling them they ought to work with their hands, as the Apostles did. They reject all the titles of Prelates, as Pope, Bishop, etc. That no man ought to be compelled by force in matters of faith. They condemn all ecclesiastical offices, and look upon them as null and void. They despise the privileges of the Church, and disregard the immunity of the Church and of persons and things belonging to it. They condemn councils and synods, and say that all parochial rights are only inventions; and that all the observances of the Religious are nothing else but Pharisaical traditions.

"As to the second part of their errors, they condemn all the sacraments of the Church. Concerning the sacrament of Baptism, they say, that the Catechism signifies nothing; that the **ABSOLUTION PRONOUNCED OVER INFANTS AVAILS THEM NOTHING; that the godfathers and godmothers do not understand what they answer the Priest;** that the oblation which is called *al wegen* is nothing but a mere invention. They reject all exorcisms and blessings: they wonder why none but the Bishops alone should have power to confirm. Concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist they say, that a Priest guilty of mortal sin, cannot celebrate that Sacrament; but that a good layman, yea, a woman, if she knows the sacramental words, may. That transubstantiation is not performed by the hands of him who celebrates unworthily, but in the mouth of the worthy receiver, and that it may be celebrated on our common tables. Malaeh. In every place shall a pure offering be offered to my name. They condemn the

custom of believers communicating no more than once a year, whereas they communicate **daily**. **That transubstantiation is performed by words uttered in the vulgar tongue. That the Mass signifies nothing; that the Apostles knew nothing of it**, and that it is only done for gain. They reject the Canon of the Mass, and only make use of the words of Christ in their vulgar tongue. They declare the singing in the Church to be no better than hellish howling. They despise canonical hours. That the offering made by the Priest in the Mass is of no value. They reject the kiss of peace, that of the altar of the Priest's hands, and Pope's feet. They say concerning the sacrament of Penance, that none can be absolved by a wicked Priest. That a good layman hath the power of absolving; and that they, by laying on of their hands, can forgive sins and confer the Holy Ghost. That it is much better to confess to a good laic, than to a wicked Priest. That no heavy penances ought to be imposed according to the example of Christ, who said to the woman taken in adultery, Go thy way, and sin no more. All public penances and chains they disapprove of, especially in women. That a general confession ought not to be made every year. They condemn the sacrament of Marriage, declaring, that those who enter into the state of marriage without hope of children are guilty of mortal sin. Compaternity, they say, signifies nothing as to the hindering of marriage, neither have they any regard to the degrees of carnal or spiritual affinity, which the Church observes, nor to the impediments of order and public decency, or to the prohibition of the Church in that matter. That a woman after childbirth doth not stand in need of any blessing or churching. **That it was an error of the Church to forbid the Clergy to marry**; whereas the same is allowed of by the Eastern Church: that it is no sin in those who are continent, to kiss or embrace. **They disallow of the sacrament of extreme Unction**, because the same is only given to the rich, and because many Priests are necessary to administer it. They hold the sacrament of Orders to be of no use, because every good layman is a Priest, the Apostles themselves being all laymen. That the preaching of a wicked Priest cannot profit any body. That what is uttered in the Latin tongue can be of no use to laymen. They mock at the tonsure of Priests. They reproach the Church that she raiseth bastards, boys, and notorious sinners, to high ecclesiastical dignities. That every layman, yea, and woman too, may preach. Corinth. For you may all prophesy one by one, that all may be edified. **WHATSOEVER IS PREACHED WITHOUT SCRIPTURE PROOF, THEY ACCOUNT NO BETTER THAN FABLES. That the holy Scripture is of the same efficacy in the vulgar tongue as in Latin**, and accordingly they communicate, and administer the sacraments in the vulgar tongue. **They can say a great part of the Old and New Testament by heart**. They despise the Decretals, and the sayings and expositions of holy men, and only cleave to the text of Scripture. They condemn excommunication, neither do they value absolution, which they expect from God alone. **They reject the indulgences of the Church**, deride dispensations, neither do they believe any irregularity. They admit none for saints, save only the Apostles; **they pray to no saint. They condemn the canonization, translation, and the vigils of the saints**. They laugh at those laymen who choose themselves saints at the altar. They never read the Litany. They give no credit to the legends of the saints, and make a mock of the saints' miracles. They despise the relics of the saints. They abhor the wood of the holy cross, because of Christ's suffering on it, neither do they sign themselves with it. **That the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles is sufficient to salvation, without any Church statutes and ordinances. That the traditions of the Church are no better than the traditions of the Pharisees**; and that greater stress is laid on the observation of human traditions, than on the keeping of the law of God. Matthew, Why do ye transgress the law of God by your traditions? **They refute the mystical sense of Scripture**, especially in sayings and actions traditionally delivered and published by the Church; as that the cock upon steeples signifies the pastor, and such like.

"Their errors of a third rank are these; they condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs, which they do not read of in the Gospel, as the observation of Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the reconciliation of penitents, the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. They despise the feast of Easter, and all other festivals of Christ and the saints, because of their being multiplied to that vast number, and say, that one day is as good as another, and work upon holydays, where they can do it, without being taken notice of. They disregard the Church fests, alleging that of Isaiah 58. Is this the fast that I have chosen? They deride and mock at all dedications, consecrations, and benedictions of candles, ashes, palm branches, oil, fire, wax-candles, agnus Dei, women after childbearing, strangers, holy places and persons, vestments, salt and water. They look upon the church, built of stone, to be no better than a common barn, and call it commonly steinbaus, neither do they believe that God dwells there; Acts 17. God doth not dwell in temples made with hands: and that prayer made in them is of no greater efficacy, than those which we offer up in our closets, Matthew 6. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet. They have no value for the dedication of churches, and call the ornaments of the altar, the sin of the Church, and that it were much better to clothe the poor, than to deck walls. They say concerning the altar, that it is wastefulness to let so

much cloth lie rotting upon stones, and that Christ never gave to his disciples vests, nor rockets, nor mitres. They celebrate the Eucharist in their household cups, and say, that the corporal, or cloth on which the Host is laid, is no holier than the cloth of their breeches. Concerning lights used in the Church, they say, that God, who is the true light, doth not stand in need of light, and that it can have no further use in the Church, than to hinder the Priests from stumbling in the dark. They reject all censings. Holy water they esteem no better than common water. the images and pictures in the church they declare to be idolatry. They mock at the singing in churches, that the efficacy is only in words, and not in the music. They deride the cries of the laymen, and reject all festival processions, as those at Easter, as well as mournful processions in Rogation-week and at funerals. They say, that the singing by day and by night is a thing lately instituted by Gregory, which in former times was not used in the Church. They find fault, that the Priest suffers many masses to be sung the same day for several persons. They laugh at the custom of bringing sick persons on a bench before the altar to make their supplications there for health. They rejoice whenever there is a public interdict, because then they corrupt many, saying, that they are forced to go to church for outward gain's sake; for they themselves also go to church, and hypocritically offer, confess, and communicate. They dissuade people from going on pilgrimage to Rome, and other places beyond sea; though they themselves pretend to go on pilgrimage, whereas it is only with design to visit their Bishops, who live in Lombardy. They express no value for the Lord's sepulcher, as well as those of the saints; and condemn the burying in churches. Matthew 23: Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, because ye build the tombs, etc.; and would choose rather to be buried in the field than in the church-yard, were they not afraid of the Church. That the offices for the deceased, masses for the dead, offerings, funeral pomps, last wills, legacies, visiting of graves, the reading of vigils, anniversary masses, and other like suffrages, are of no advantage to the souls of the deceased. They condemn the watching with the dead by night, because of the follies and wickedness which are acted on these occasions. They disallow of the confraternities of clergymen and laymen, which is called zech; and declare that all these are only invented for lucre's sake."

"They hold all these errors, because **they deny purgatory**, saying, that there are no more than two ways, the one of the elect to heaven, the other of the damned to hell. Ecclesiastes 11: Which way soever the tree falleth, there it must lie. That a good man stands in no need of any intercessions, and that they cannot profit those that are wicked. That all sins are mortal, and none at all venial. That once praying of the Lord's Prayer is of more efficacy than the ringing of ten bells, yea, than the Mass itself. That all swearing is a mortal sin; Matthew: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; but let your communication be, Yea, yea, and Nay, nay. They think it is an oath to say verily or certainly, thereby to excuse himself from sin; that he may not divulge secrets: yea, they account him worse than a murderer, that compels another to swear; as likewise he that confers confirmation, because he exacts an oath from the party that is confirmed, and a judge of witnesses in law; as likewise doth the Inquisitor and the Priest, that force men to abjure their sins, by which means many become perjured. They reprove those who assert, that he who breaks his promise or oath made to the Priest is guilty of seven perjuries. That all judges and princes are damned, and they declare, that malefactors ought not to be condemned; Romans 12: Vengeance is mine, I will repay it, saith the Lord. Matthew 13, Suffer them both to grow together till the time of harvest. They say, that all ecclesiastical courts, held by Clergymen, are not maintained for the correction of evil doers, but for the profit which they bring along with them."

"AEneas Sylvius gives us the following account of the Waldenses of Bohemia, in his history of that kingdom: That the Pope of Rome is equal with other Bishops: that there is no difference amongst Priests: that priesthood is not a dignity, but that grace and virtue only give the preference: that the souls of the deceased are either immediately plunged into hell, or advanced to eternal joys: **that there is no purgatory fire: that it is a vain thing to pray for the dead**, and a mere invention of priestly covetousness: that **the images of God and the saints ought to be destroyed**: that the blessing of water and palm branches is ridiculous: that the religion of the Mendicants was invented by evil spirits: that priests ought to be poor, and only content themselves with alms: that every one has liberty to preach: no capital sin ought to be tolerated upon pretense of avoiding a greater evil: that he who is guilty of mortal sin ought not to enjoy any secular or ecclesiastical dignity, or to be obeyed in any thing: that the confirmation which is celebrated with anointing, and extreme Unction, is none of the sacraments of the Church: that **auricular Confession is a piece of foppery**: that every one in his closet ought to confess his sins to God: that Baptism ought to be celebrated without the addition of holy oil: that the use of churchyards is vain, and nothing but a covetous invention: that it is all one what ground dead bodies be buried in: that the temple of the great God is the whole world, and that it is a limiting of the Divine Majesty, to build churches, monasteries, and oratories, as if the Divine Goodness could more favourably be found in them than elsewhere: that the

priestly vestments, altar, ornaments, palls, corporals, chalices, patins, and other vessels, are of no efficacy: that a Priest may in any place consecrate the body of Christ, and give it to those who desire it, by reciting only. the sacramental words: that it is in vain to implore the suffrages of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven, because they cannot help us: that it is to no purpose to spend one's time in singing and saying the Canonical Hours: that we are to cease from working on no day except the Lord's day: that the holydays of saints are to be rejected; and that there is no merit in observing the fasts instituted by the Church."

I do believe that it is not too hard for any judicious reader to consider,

1. The difference between those accounts given by these authors: it is too sensible not to be suddenly perceived.
2. That the Dominican Friar has strangely increased the number of controversies, picking out all occasions to exasperate his reader against them.
3. That he has represented those controversies in a very scurrilous manner, to make them the more ridiculous: from which way we do confess that Aeneas Sylvius was very far.

CHAPTER 23

Some instances of the arguments which the Waldenses of Bohemia waged in their disputes with the Church of Rome.

The same Inquisitor, whose extract I have but now given, gives us an account of the manner how the Bohemians, who were a colony of the Waldenses, managed their controversies with the Church of Rome. I did not conceive it fitting to change any thing in his style, nor to make my reflections on the objections which he puts into their mouths; it being enough that I have given my reader notice, that it is an Inquisitor that makes them speak so.

"The first error, saith he, of the poor of Lyons, who are also called Leonists, is, that the Church of Rome is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but an assembly of wicked men, and the whore that sits upon the beast in the Revelation. And that the Church of Rome ceased to be the true Church under Pope Sylvester, at which time it was poisoned by temporal possessions and advantages. And that they are the Church of Jesus Christ, because they observe the doctrine of the Gospel and Apostles in their words and actions. "To proceed to other of their errors: they condemn all the statutes of the Church, and prove them to be null and void, from Scripture and reason. Levit. And Nadab and Abihu took their censers, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. Now he offers strange fire, who observes or teacheth other traditions contrary to the command of God, and such are all the traditions of the Church. Therefore, etc. they say, that the doctrine of the Gospel and the Apostles is sufficient to salvation, and that the canons are mere traditions. Matthew Why do you transgress the command of God to establish your traditions?

"They say, that the occasion of this their error is, because the statutes of the Church are burdensome and many, whereas those of Christ are few and easy. Acts, Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear? And that the multiplying of precepts necessarily causeth an implication of transgressions. Item, That those statutes of the Church, which belong to church lands and possessions, are directly contrary to the commands of God. Deuteronomy The Priests shall have no inheritance with the people. Item, The laws of Christ are universal, and reach all those of the Church, particularly that of tithes, Deuteronomy That the Eastern Church doth not regard the statutes of the Church of Rome. Item, That they who make them do not observe them; Matthew They bind heavy burdens on others. Item, That the statutes of the Church are often changed, as may be seen in the case of degrees of consanguinity; whereas those of Christ do never change; Luke, But my words shall not pass away. That the Church ordains those things she thinks to be for her own advantage, as her immunity, etc.; that the laws of Christ are finite, whereas those of the Church are infinite.

"They declare the Pope to be head and ringleader of all errors. The Prelates they call blind, and the Religious, Pharisees. They are of opinion, that all Clergymen that do not work for their living are guilty of sin; and say they are full of pride, covetousness, envy. Of pride, because they love the uppermost seats, and to be called of men, Rabbi. Of covetousness, because they do all for filthy lucre sake; Jerem. From the least to the greatest of them, they run after covetousness. Of envy because they alone will be masters; Luke: Woe unto you, Scribes, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge. Wherefore they say, that every man, yea, and woman too, may preach; Numbers: Moses said, Would to God that all the Lord's people were prophets. And the Apostle St. Paul, For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may be edified. Luke, If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out. Revelations, Let him that hears, say, Come. And because the Apostles themselves were laymen, therefore because if a layman may preach for gain, much more may he preach for God."

"They declare also, that God alone is to be obeyed, and not the Prelates or Pope. They say, the Church is guilty of idolatry, by suffering such doctrines as these to be preached; that the Pope is a God on earth, greater than men, equal with angels, and that he cannot sin. They reproach us for calling the Pope Father, and the Monks for calling their Abbots so; Matthew Call ye no man father upon earth, for One is your

Father, etc. They deny also, that they ought to be obeyed in whatsoever they command. They reject kneeling to Priests, alleging that of the angel forbidding John to kneel to him."

"They condemn the sacraments of the Church, because of the undue and irreverent manner wherein they are celebrated by many Priests; and because they set them to sale, as also because of the wicked and scandalous lives of many Ministers. They declare the Pope and all Bishops to be murderers, by reason of the wars which they maintain and stir up against Christians, Pagans, and Heretics: and they condemn those that preach up the holy war, because they say the Turks and Pagans ought not to be forced to embrace the faith by the sword, but to be allured by preaching."

"Some of them are in an error concerning Baptism, holding, that infants cannot be saved by it; Matthew Whosoever shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved: but an infant does not believe, therefore is not saved. Some of them do baptize, others use imposition of hands instead of baptism. And the occasion of this their practice is, because they say the godfathers do not understand the questions put to them by the Priest."

"They reject the Chrism; they slight Confirmation; yet some few amongst them do receive it, though they be fifty years of age.

"They find fault, that the Bishops only appropriate Confirmation to themselves; whereas the sacrament of the Lord's body, which is much more worthy, is permitted to Priests.

"They hold, that a Priest in mortal sin cannot give the Eucharist, because Uzzah was struck dead for touching the ark, and John durst not touch the Lord's head. They maintain, that a pious layman, yea, a woman, so she do but know the words, may give the Eucharist; and that transubstantiation is not made in the hands of him that celebrates, but in the mouth of the worthy receiver; Psalms, The Lord hath heard the desire of the poor. That which gave occasion to this their error is, because the Levites ministered the body of the Lord; as Laurenflus and Tharsinus, who suffered at Rome. Some also receive the Eucharist in any form; some of wild grapes; some of bread dipped in wine; some take sorrel in a dish; some after they have cleansed their mouths communicate again; others receive it with vinegar; some keep the Eucharist in their chambers and in their gardens, as in Bavaria. The Subdeacons also administer the Lord's body to the sick. A Deacon that hath been gaining or drinking all night has been known to celebrate the Eucharist the next morning in his shirt. Witness Goth, one of the arch-heretics, that the Eucharist has been seen to crawl with vermin, according to Zuvetch; witness the Monks there. That they often trample under their feet the body and blood of the Lord. That it is also received and handled amongst them by those who are unworthy, and public sinners, and denied to the worthy, as to nuns and widows, except sometimes in the Lord's Supper. Also in the country it is seldom given by scholars without a price put upon it; the reason is, because the churches are let to the country curates at a dear rate, and the curates are not: able to give it to the scholars without price.

"They hold the Mass to be worth nothing, alleging, that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever sung Mass: that Christ was only offered up once for all, whereas the Priest offers him up twice in one day: that it is only for gain that so many Masses are sung; Matthew Woe unto you that devour widows' houses, under a pretense of long prayers. Item, Because they do not sing twice mattins or vigils. They hold them also guilty of sin who buy masses. They say, that the first mass of the new minor Priest is of no more efficacy than the hundredth: the occasion of this their error is, because some preach, that a sinful Priest is as clean from all sin as an angel, by putting on his casula. Some feign to celebrate the Eucharist without the Canon. They call the church-music infernal melody, and that all is done for gain; and that it is loss to men to be hindered from their work. They condemn canonical hours, and say, that one Pater Noster is better than the noise of ten bells. They hold all oblations to be of no use to the offerer, but only to those who receive them; Luke, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice. That it is better to give to the poor, than to offer to the Priest. If that place be objected to them, When thou offerest thy gift at the altar, etc. they answer, that the word gift there is to be understood of an occasion, or a good work. The occasion that seems to have led them into this error is, because they see that the offerings are ill spent by some: and they detract from the Mass, because of the superfluous singing and tediousness of it, and because sometimes the Priest scolds whilst he is saying Mass, and being put into a passion, breaks off the Mass abruptly. They say, that the

custom of buying masses is a kind of simony. Some call good customs luciferous inventions; and these they compel men to observe, as that which they vulgarly call Allwegen.

"Concerning the sacrament of Penance, they hold, that a Priest bound in mortal sin cannot absolve any, and that a pious layman can do it much better; for who can expect to be made clean by him who is filthy himself? Malachi I will curse your blessings. Luke, Physician, cure thyself Matthew Cast out first the beam that is, etc. Isaiah The bed is too narrow, so that one of the two must needs tumble down, and the cloak too short to cover both. By the bed they understand the soul; by both the persons they understand God and the Devil. They hold, that a pious layman has power to absolve. That which a man has not, how can he give? That therefore it is much better to confess to a good layman, than to a wicked Priest. The occasion of this their error is, because they see that sometimes a Bohemian Priest takes the confession of a German, whereas neither of them understands the other; and because sometimes the confession of ten persons is heard together; and sometimes confession is made by an interpreter, because, say they, public confession is made by the damned themselves: also because some say that confession avails nothing without offering a gift; and that therefore they neglect to hear the confessions of the poor, which is a piece of Judaism. Also because it is the property of godly souls to acknowledge themselves many times in fault, when they are not; and that Priests do not compel mothers, who do not see their sick infants die, to undergo a public penance, which is used to be imposed for the most common sin; and thus still crying, Tomorrow, tomorrow, they run headlong into sin. And that they are forced many times to bear the burden of many of these penances, that they may be restored again to the communion of the Church, whereas indeed they never had lost or forfeited it. Item, Because they see that for manifest sins only pecuniary mulcts are imposed, and so no satisfaction is given to the Church; so that the easiness of obtaining pardon becomes an argument to the sinner to sin on: because for secret sins they impose only such a number of masses. Item, Because some Confessors do indirectly betray their confessions, as by writing it down, that it may be read of others. Also a wife secretly procuring her own miscarriage, is sent to the Bishop, and being suspected, is worthily put to death.

"They condemn the sacrament of Marriage, saying, that it is a mortal sin to marry without the hope of children. Others of them look upon matrimony to be no better than fornication. The occasion of this their error is derived partly from marriage itself, because married persons neither observe time, nor the bounds of matrimony; and partly from the Priests, because they compel chaste wives to seek their fugitive husbands through many countries, who yet are not bound to cohabit with their husbands, except they please; and by this many of them are corrupted. Item, Because a bride that is a virgin is forbid entrance into the Church for eleven days, whereas she who has committed fornication is not so much as kept out one day. So in like manner, if she be brought to bed of a still-born child: whereas by the Canons she may enter the Church the first day after. Item, Because some preach, that a woman dying in childbed is damned; because they deny the blessing to poor women that have nothing to offer at their churching; and that they who are ready to be brought to bed are forced to sin, and so miscarry.

"They say, that the sacrament of extreme Unction is the highest pride. The occasion hereof is, because this sacrament is given to none but those who can well pay for it; and the multitude of Priests is the cause of that: and though it be honourable to bring in more Priests, yet extreme Unction, as well as Baptism and Confirmation, are always administered only by one. Item, Because some preach, that this sacrament ought not to be administered to any, except they be at least worth two cows; which is a great scandal to the poor. And because they say, that twelve lights are necessary at the celebrating of extreme Unction, whereas one light is accounted sufficient at the celebration of the Eucharist, which is the most worthy sacrament of all.

"They say, that the sacrament of Order is of no use, because the Apostles were laymen; and that Christ never gave them either rochets, mitres, hoods, rings, or any other ornament. They deride tonsure, because the Apostles knew nothing of it. The reason which they go upon is, because such who are unworthy both as to their life and knowledge, and bastards, are advanced to orders and dignities, scandalizing the Church of God both by their word and example.

"They say likewise, that the Church has greatly erred in forbidding the Clergy to marry, because as well the old Law as the Gospel do allow of it; and by their winking in the mean time at fornication. Item, By her advancing of bastards to the highest promotions in the Church. Item, Some say, that whatever those who have vowed chastity, above the girdle, do by kissing, feeling, words, pressing of the breasts, embraces, is all done in charity.

"They condemn excommunication, and say, that it is nothing else but cursing. Genesis He who curseth thee, shall be cursed, etc. Ecclesiastes When a wicked man curseth the Devil, he curseth his own soul: wherefore if he curseth a man, he curseth himself. Cursers and evil-speakers shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Some say, an unjust excommunication doth stand good. Item, Whenever there is an interdict, the heretics rejoice, because then they have an opportunity to corrupt Christians, and make them undervalue the worship of God. That it is an ungodly thing to vex and punish the innocent, by denying them the sacraments, for the sins of others: that by this means the praise of God and of the court of heaven is taken away, and the souls in purgatory are deprived of the suffrages of the Church, and the devotion of living believers lessened; and therefore they say, that then tenths ought not to be paid. The occasion of this their error is, because excommunications are multiplied upon any slight occasion, as, for the tenth penny; or if a man doth not come to church, in these and such like cases persons are excommunicated without any lawful order, and afterwards are again admitted to communicate without foregoing absolution; by which means he who gives the sacrament, as well as the excommunicated person, and the people, are in danger.

"They hold, that tithes ought not to be given, because they were never given in the primitive Church; and that if tithes ought not to be received, neither ought they to be paid. If you say, that they ought to be given, because the Jews gave them, by the same reason all other legal constitutions are to be observed. They allege also, that there are but few countries, though governed by Roman law, where tithes are paid. They say, it is sin to pay tithes; and that laymen who receive tithes do sin likewise, because they are so wickedly spent. They say, that the Clergy and Priests ought to have no propriety or possessions: Deuteronomy Neither priests nor Levites, nor any that are of the tribe of Levi, shall have any inheritance with the people of Israel, because the sacrifices are their portion. Acts, rind they called nothing their own, of all that they possessed, but they had all things common. They do not believe indulgences; Luke, Who can forgive sin, save God alone? They despise the Church absolutions, and do not mind irregularity, nor have they any faith in the Church's dispensations. That which led them into this error was the multiplying of indulgences, and because future punishment is bought off by the people; which they do not believe.

"They despise the feasts of the Church, saying, that one day is like another. If it be objected to them, that God has commanded the seventh day to be sanctified; they answer, that if for that reason the Sabbath-day is to be kept, that circumcision is to be kept for the same reason.

"They took offense at them, because there are no less than an hundred and twenty holy days in a year; because some say, that the feast of Easter and Pentecost are the feasts of St. Stephen and St. John: because fairs are kept on holydays: because holydays are transferred to Sundays for gain: because tailors and carriers are suffered to work then: because there be too many holydays, translations, inventions, and octaves, so that there is scarce a week which has not two or three of them: because they are introduced only for gain, which is a great scandal to the people: because workmen, by being hindered from their work, do thereby fall to poverty: because on those days more sins are committed than any other: because the primitive Church had very few feasts; wherefore also they secretly work on those days.

"They despise the fasts of the Church; for on Good Friday they eat flesh; The kingdom of God is not meat, etc. Isaiah, Is this the fast that I have chosen? Corinthians, Let not him that eats not, judge him that eats. The ground of their error was, because poor men and laborers are obliged in Lent to fast with bread and water; and also, because they can get no work, upon the account of these days of abstinence.

"The material edifice of the church they esteem to be no better than a barn, and nickname it commonly the stonehouse; Acts, God doth not dwell in temples made with hands: and that prayers made in them are of no more efficacy than if they were made in any other house; Luke, But thou, when thou prayest, enter into, etc. John, Neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem shall ye worship, etc. Acts, Lifting up pure hands in all places. The occasion of their mistake was, because the Church makes men carnal; it being a place of their acting in masquerade, and making a show with their fine clothes.

"They contemn the dedication of churches: they call the altar an heap of stones; and that it is a piece of wastefulness to let cloth rot upon stones. The occasion; the prodigious expenses laid out upon churches, which might with far greater profit be bestowed upon the poor: Matthew Do you see all these buildings? there shall not be left a stone, etc. As also, because some set up taverns in the church; and because some say, that as oft as a man goes round the church, so many mortal sins are forgiven him. Also because some

say and preach, that to frequent a strange church is a committing of adultery: that it is better to preach in a stable than in the church. The ornaments of the church they say are sinful, and that it is better to clothe the poor than to hang walls. The corporal, they say, is no better than the cloth of their breeches. Concerning lights in the church, they say, that God, who is the true light, doth not stand in need of light; and that the cup used in the Sacrament doth not differ from a common household cup, because formerly they made use of glass chalices. They reject censings: they value holy Water no more than common water: images and pictures, they say, are idolatry; Exodus 20: Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, etc. These errors arose from the scandal which they took at the horrid wooden images and pictures which they daily saw, and which, in their opinion, rather strike a man with horror than devotion. They deride church-music, saying, that virtue and efficacy is in words, and not in the melody. This sprung originally from the tedious and superfluous singing in churches. They mock at the cries and shouts of the people. They contemn processions, because of the follies that are acted at them.

"They believe no saints, besides the Apostles, and such as are mentioned in the Gospels or Acts of the Apostles; they call upon no saint, no, not the blessed Virgin, but God alone. This proceeded from the many false saints, as Vivianus and others, whose names, lives, and merits, are unknown. They show no respect to spring, as in Drozo, where the Priest baptizeth the crucifix in the spring, and the people offer to the spring. Item, Holy trees, as those of St. Christopher, and the air in the fields. Item, They deride the names of the saints, as Erhardo, honoring them with oblations. Item, Because no devotion is expressed to the saints of the Old Testament: because the honor which ought to be given to God, is more exhibited to creatures than to God alone. Thus some fast every Wednesday in honor of St. Nicholas, who do not fast on Friday in honor of God; and so likewise when St. Nicholas is named, all sigh; whereas when Jesus Christ is named, all hold their peace. They give no credit to the legends and sufferings of the saints. This arose from the contradiction about Constantine's baptism, and many things altogether incredible, as in the legend of St. Margaret and Juliana, and the Seven Sleepers. They do not believe the miracles of the saints. This incredulity was occasioned by the many false miracles, as oil, blood, tears of images, and heavenly light. And by reason of those hypocrites, who are commonly called Sterzet, who, pretending themselves to be afflicted with divers sicknesses, declare they are suddenly recovered.

"They give no credit to the relics of saints. This was occasioned by the false relics which some carry about, as the milk of the blessed Virgin, who with a small quantity of milk suckled our Savior, and a salamander for the garment of the blessed Virgin, and the sweat of Christ, and the membrane in which our Savior was wrapt, and the relics of angels. Likewise because one of these relicmongers boasted, that he could make what saints he pleased; and being asked how, answered, that he often took the bone of an ox, and sawed it into small pieces, which he wrapt up in purple, writing about them the names of what saints he pleased: and because they baptize the milk of the blessed Virgin, and then give the water to drink. Item, Because they make merchandise of them, and are often eaten by mice; which thing was related to the people by this Priest, and the people much scandalized thereat. Because several churches quarrel and dispute about the bodies of saints, each maintaining that they have them, as about the body of St. Mark, St. Vitus, and the rest.

"They abhor the holy cross, because of Christ's suffering thereon. Their aversion seems to have been taken from the sermons of those who maintained, that the cross being taken away from Christ, returned of itself. They say, that the wood of the cross is no more than other wood: they do not arm themselves with the sign of the cross. They set no value upon the sepulcher of our Lord, nor of the saints; Matthew, Woe to you, Pharisees, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets. They despise church burial, for they would rather choose to be buried in a field than in a church-yard, but that they stand in fear of the Church. Their reason for this opinion is, because those who die without contrition are buried there, and they who kill themselves; and on the contrary, many times church burial is denied to those who die truly contrite: because money is demanded for every one, even for infants, who do not stand in need of any suffrages, and for lepers: because some saints were formerly buried in gardens, as our Savior; some in their own houses, some in the water, as St. Clemens. They reject the watching with the dead, because of the follies committed on those occasions; because the laws of the Church, from the beginning of the world, and the ecclesiastical canons, do allow every man to choose his burying-place where he pleaseth; because many quarrels and contests arise about dead bodies, and frequent scandals both to believers and unbelievers. They condemn all pilgrimages, because of those many abuses which they have given occasion to, as, that many women who go on pilgrimages have been debauched by the way; and because of the false and counterfeit

pilgrims, which they call Stezzar. Item, Because they say, that Christ and his Apostles built his Church on the waters, and that to pilgrims all sins are forgiven, as much as in Baptism.

"They deny purgatory, and maintain that there are only two ways, the one of the elect to heaven, the other of the damned to hell; Which way soever the tree falls, there it lies. They say, that neither masses, nor anniversaries, nor offerings, nor other suffrages, are of any profit to the souls of the deceased, but that they are only done for the gain that comes by them to the Priests. To that place in the Corinthians, If any build hay or stubble, he shall be saved, but so as by fire; they answer, that by fire there, is to be understood the fire of tribulation and affliction. St. Aust. He who prays for his mother, does his mother an injury; therefore he who causeth masses to be said for his children, or prays for them, does rather injure than benefit them. If a man be good, he stands in no need of any suffrages; if wicked, they can do him no good; John, I pray for them, not for the world; that is, for worldly men. Now if we be not to pray for them whilst they are alive, much less when they are dead. They say, that the prayers of a good layman are of more profit than those of a wicked Priest; and that one Lord's Prayer is of greater efficacy than many masses; John, We know that God does not hear sinners. Isaiah, When you multiply your prayers, I will not hear. Greg. Cum is quibus displicet ad intercedendum mittitur, reati animus ad deteriora provocatur.

"They say, that Latin prayers can be of no advantage to laymen. They hold three errors about purgatory: the first is, that no sin is venial, but all are mortal; the second is, that when the sin is forgiven, the punishment is also remitted; whence men take an occasion of sinning more freely, and making void the sacrament of Penance. Matthew, Repent. Luke, Bring forth fruits meet for repentance. The third error is, that intercessions are unprofitable.

"They condemn judges and princes, saying, that malefactors ought not to be condemned; Matthew Judge not, lest ye be judged, etc. Genesis, He that sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed. Exodus, Thou shalt not kill. Matthew, Put up thy sword in the sheath, for he who smites with the sword, etc. Matthew in the parable of the tares, Suffer both of them to grow together till the harvest. They seem to have been led into these mistakes, because judges and princes are generally unjust and tyrants; and because justice is set at a price in ecclesiastical as well as other courts of judicature. Isaiah, Woe unto you that justify the wicked for a reward, and turn away the righteousness of the righteous; they do not judge the fatherless, and the cause of the widow will they not hear.

"They say, that to swear is a mortal sin. Matthew, But I say unto you, Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is God's throne, etc. but let your discourse be Yea, yea; and Nay, nay. The frequent and continual swearing, upon the slightest causes, has given occasion to this error; as also because heretics by this means fall into perjury. They who never swear are like the Devil, of whom we do not read that he ever swore."

These are the errors which he attributes to the Waldenses of Bohemia, many of them by mere calumny, some others by an ill construction of their doctrine, as our writers Perrin and Usserius have demonstrated.

As to their conduct, he gives this account of them:

"Heretics are known by their manners and words; for they are orderly and modest in their manners and behavior; they avoid all pride in their habits, as wearing neither very rich clothes, nor over mean and ragged ones. They keep up no commerce or trade, to avoid lies, swearing, and deceit, but only live by the labor of their own hands, as handicraftsmen and day laborers; and their teachers are weavers and tailors. They do not heap up riches, but are content with necessities. They are also very chaste. They are sparing and very temperate in eating and drinking; they do not frequent taverns or alehouses, neither do they go to balls or other vanities. They abstain from anger. When they work, they either learn or teach; and therefore pray but little. They hypocritically go to church, offer, confess, communicate, and hear sermons, to catch the preacher in his words. In like manner also their women are very modest, avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, no levity of words, and especially abstaining from lies and swearing; not so much as making use of the common asseverations, In truth, For certain, or the like, because they look upon these to be oaths. They seldom answer directly to the questions demanded of them. So if you ask them, Are you acquainted with the Gospel or the Epistles? they answer, Who should have taught me them? Or else, These are for them to learn who are of a great and deep understanding, or those who are fit for such things, and have

leisure for them. They commonly say only, Yea, yea; No, no; and say, This is lawful for them, because Christ said to the Jews, Pull down this temple, though he meant it not concerning Solomon's temple."

The manners and behavior of the Waldenses is as follows:

"They kneel down upon the ground, before a bench, or such like, and continue thus in all their prayers in silence, as long as one might repeat a Pater Noster thirty or forty times, and conclude their prayers by repeating the word Amen several times. And this they do every day very reverently, amongst those of their own persuasion, without the company of any strangers, before noon, after noon, and at night when they go to bed; and in the mornings when they rise out of bed: besides some other times as well in the day, morning and at night. They say, teach, nor have any other prayer besides Our Father. They do not look upon the salutation of the angel to be a prayer, nor the Apostles' Creed; and say, that these were introduced by the Church of Rome, not by Christ. However they have drawn up a short draught of the seven articles concerning the Godhead, and as many concerning the human nature, the Ten Commandments, and the seven works of mercy, which they say and teach, and boast much of them, and readily offer themselves to answer any one that demands of them a reason of their faith. Before they set themselves down to table, they bless it, saying, Bless the Lord. Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us, Lord have mercy upon us. Our Father, etc. After which, the eldest of the company saith in the vulgar tongue, God, who blessed the five barley loaves and two fishes in the desert before his disciples, bless this table, and that which is upon it, and which shall be set upon it, (and then make the sign of the cross,) in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen. And when they rise from table after dinner or supper, they give thanks in this manner; the eldest amongst them in the vulgar tongue repeating the doxology set down in the Revelation; Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, honor, power, and might, be ascribed to God alone, for ever and ever. Amen. And then adds, God render a good reward and a plentiful return to all those who are our benefactors; and the God who hath given us corporal food vouchsafe us also the life of the Spirit; and God be with us, and we with him always: and the company answer, Amen. Also when they bless the table, and when they return thanks, they fold their hands together, and lift them up towards heaven. And after dinner, when they have returned thanks, and prayed as before said, they preach, teach, and exhort according to their way and doctrine.

In the year of our Lord 1391, the 4th of September, were underwritten the errors of the sect of the Waldenses. Then he gives an account of their Ministers.

First, Nicholas of Poland, the son of a husbandman; Conrad of Saxony, of the town of Dubun, near Wisseburg, the son of a husbandman; Walriek of Hardech, a tailor; Conrad of Gamundia, of the county of Suabia, the son of a husbandman; Simon of Salig, an Hungarian, a tailor; Herannus of Mistelgen, a Bavarian, by his trade a carpenter; John of Drena, a Bavarian, likewise a carpenter. These aforementioned are called amongst them apostles, masters, angels, and brethren."

Their life and conversation is thus: first,

"they fast three or four days in a week, with bread and water, except they be obliged to work hard. After this they appear amongst those who are of the same faith with them, as their superiors. They pray seven times in a day. The eldest begins the prayer, and makes it either long or short, according as he thinks fitting, and the company goes along with him in his prayer. Their teachers go very meanly dressed; they walk two and two together, an old man with a young man, wherever they go, They are very wary in their words, and avoid lies, oaths, and all filthy things; and inform and exhort their auditory to do the same."

CHAPTER 24

Concerning the government of the Churches of the Waldenses, and of the succession of their Ministers.

If we had a well continued history of the Churches of the Valleys, it would be easy for us to make it appear,

1. That they have always exactly preserved amongst them a church government, in the same manner as it was established in the midst of the eleventh century, after their separation from the Church of Rome, which happened in the time of Wido, Archbishop of Milan, in the year of our Lord 1059, and that they distinguished their Clergy into three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.
2. That their Ministers exercised these holy functions, extraordinarily to the edification of their people.
3. That it is not true, that they gave leave to laymen to preach or administer the sacraments. But we own it to be a difficult thing to set down the succession of their Pastors, and to specify them by name, the persecutions they continually lay under having destroyed almost all their ancient records; in the mean time there are still some testimonies of their adversaries remaining, which evidently prove the first article.

First, Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, in his treatise against the sect of the Waldenses and Arians, chap. 6, accuseth only some of the Waldenses of having no Pastors; which shows, that the body of that Church had a fixed ministry before the end of the twelfth century; and whereas elsewhere he chargeth them with usurping the Church ministry, it is either a very false accusation, or which only respected some of Peter Waldo's disciples, who, being dispersed by the persecution, thought themselves in that state to have right to preach, and to oppose the errors of the Church of Rome. Secondly, Raynerus, who lived in 1250, doth acknowledge, that they had their Bishops in Lombardy, cap. 5. Lombardiam intrantes, visitant Episcopos suos; "When they come into Lombardy they visit their Bishops."

Matthew Paris, ad ann. 1243, speaks of a Bishop of the Patarines in Cremona, who was deposed by them for fornication. Pilickdorph, whom the Bishop of Meaux quotes, shows, that they did not approve of a layman's celebrating the Eucharist, chap. 1. which sufficiently proves, that they made a signal difference between the Clergy and the people; and that it is absolutely false, that they were only a company of laymen, who took to themselves the power of preaching and administering the sacraments, though nothing be more obvious in the writings of their adversaries than this charge.

If we east our eyes upon the colonies they have sent to several places, we shall find the same discipline in use amongst them. Thus we see that in the kingdom of Naples they had a superior, who conferred Orders in the city of Aquila. We find the same thing in Bohemia, in the Confession of Faith they presented to Uladislau, p. 836. Ordinandi majoribus aut minoribus ordinibus, promovendi vita virtuosa, in Christif de, etc. The same is observed in an ancient abridgment of the opinions of the Waldenses, recorded by Wolfius, Lect. Memor. ad ann. 1160. p. 380: "They absolutely deny the Popes primacy over all Churches, and more especially his power over all policies, that is, his power of both swords; neither do they hold, that any other orders ought to be retained in the Church, but those of Priests, Deacons, and Bishops."

Guido Carmelita attributes to them the same discipline, according to the report of Alphonsus a Castro, lib. 11. p. 337. And we find the same in Claudius Seysselius adversus Errores Waldensium, fol. 10 "Those whom they judge to be the best amongst them, they appoint to be their Priests, to whom, upon all occasions, they have recourse, as to the vicars and successors of the Apostles."

We find their close adhering to this ancient constitution, from the history of Commenius, who was the only survivor of all the Bishops that escaped from the Bohemian persecution, in the history he has published concerning them, taken out of the Annals of that country, which he had saved from the fire, and

which he carefully preserved at Amsterdam: in p. 70, and the pages following, he tells us, that the believers of Bohemia and Moravia, who had separated themselves from the communion of the Papists and Calixtines, having created three Pastors from amongst themselves, found themselves greatly perplexed about their ordination; but having understood that there were Waldenses dwelling in the confines of Moravia and Austria, to the end they might fully satisfy the scruples, as well of their own consciences as of others, as well for that time as for all time to come, they resolved to send Michael Zambergius, one of their Pastors, (who formerly had received his orders from the Bishop of Rome himself,) with two others, to find out these Waldenses, and to give them an account of what passed amongst them; but above all, to ask counsel of them, concerning what they had to do in the matter they were scrupulous about: that they met with one Stephen, a Waldensian Bishop, who sent for another, and some Ministers, in the presence of whom he made it appear to these deputies of Moravia and Bohemia, that his doctrine, as well as that of all other Waldenses, was the same that was in the time of Constantine: that the said Bishop explained to them their several articles, and related to them the horrible persecutions which his fellow-brethren had endured in Italy and in France; and that finally the said Stephen, with the other forementioned, conferred the vocation and ordination upon the said three Pastors that were sent to them by the imposition of hands, with power and authority to create others, as there should be occasion: that from that time those of Bohemia and Moravia desired to unite themselves into one body with the same Waldenses; whence it came to pass, that they themselves were afterwards called Waldenses. And, page 75, he further confirms, that the Churches of Bohemia and Moravia did never deny, but that they had received the authority of laying on of hands, and external succession, from the Waldenses.

The said Comenius, who published the Discipline of the Churches of Bohemia in 1644, gives us this account of the matter in the preface to his book:

"It is evident from history, godly reader, that the Bohemian nation, after that they above two hundred years ago had been happily enlightened with the light of the Gospel, by the ministry of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, were by the deceit of Satan again enticed to the obedience of the apostate see, (only reserving to themselves the cup, and some other superficials,) viz. in the Council of Basil, ann. 1433. The city Tabor only, grieving to see the lighted candle thus hid under a bushel, opposed themselves, for many years, defending the purity of their doctrine, and their constancy in the faith, with their swords, till at last they also were partly circumvented by fraud, and partly oppressed by violence. Whereupon all those who were yet left of Huss's followers, being inflamed with a divine zeal, took courage, and separating themselves from the Calixtines, or pretended Hussites, in the year 1457, they happily set up distinct meetings in several places, supported only by the Divine assistance, as also a distinct consistory; for a little before those times, some part of the Waldenses being driven out of France, came and settled themselves in the confines of Austria, with one or two of their Bishops, to whom these Bohemians sent deputies, who declared to them their intention, desiring their counsel, and a Christian union with them: the Waldenses on the other hand commending their purpose, advised them, that if they desired to have those assemblies that embraced the pure doctrine of the Gospel to be preserved from being dissipated, they ought to take care never to want faithful pastors.

"Wherefore that they ought not to expect till some who had their ordination from Rome, should by their love to truth be brought over to them, who might ordain pastors for them, but rather ordain them themselves, as occasion should offer. And forasmuch as the said Waldenses declared that they had lawful Bishops amongst them, and a lawful and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles themselves; they very solemnly created three of our Ministers Bishops, conferring upon them the power of ordaining Ministers, though they did not think fit to take upon them the name of Bishops, because of the Antichristian abuse of that name, contenting themselves with the name of Elders. As to their union with the Waldenses, before it could be brought about, the good Waldenses were again dissipated, their Bishop, Stephen, being burnt at Vienna."

The Bishop of Meaux touches upon this history, and supposeth to have found in it an occasion of triumph, as believing that it clearly proves, that the Waldenses had no ministry at all, because they were forced to take their ordination from the Church of Rome. He observes, that they sent those whom they designed to be Priests, to Popish Bishops, to receive their ordination from them. But this indeed proves just the contrary to what he pretends.

1. It appears from hence, that they made a great distinction between the Ministers of the Gospel and the rest of the people.
2. That they did not make use of the title of necessity, but in such circumstances as made out a real necessity.
3. That though they highly declaimed against the Church of Rome and its ministry, yet they nevertheless acknowledged, that the episcopal ministry in her was lawful, if separated only from the corruptions wherewith it was stained.

However, this action, which seems so irregular, is no stranger than that of the ancient believers of Lombardy, in the time of Gregory I. who finding themselves deprived of Ministers, by reason of the Arian persecution, which had scattered them, betook themselves to the Arian Priests to have their children baptized, though in other places the validity of the Arian ministry was so little owned, that they rebaptized the children who had been baptized by them.

Neither do I believe that the Bishop has cause to reproach this poor people for their carriage in this behalf, till after he shall have persuaded those of his communion to abolish the custom they have at Rome, to permit the Greeks, whom they have seduced, and bred up in their seminaries, to receive their ordination from Greek Bishops, though they account those Bishops both schismatics and heretics, and get themselves ordained by them, with design to oppose with all their might the Greek Churches, from whence they receive their Orders by the laying on of hands.

Lastly, This Order has continued until the year 1655, as we may see by the example of Leger, who was Moderator of the Churches of the Valleys twelve years. It appears from the history of Leger, that the Moderator, who was during life, had power to call synods, and to preside in them, and to celebrate the function of laying on of hands, p. 208. And lastly, we may see a proof of what I say, in the Churches of Bohemia and Moravia, who are a colony of the ancient Waldenses. See the account Commenius gives us in the year 1660, at which time he was one of their Bishops, in his preface to the book of the Discipline of Fratres Bohemi; and see p. 167 and 168 of Leger.

As for the manner of their discharging the function of the ministry, we can sufficiently lustily them if the testimony of their greatest enemies is worthy of any consideration.

Here is the testimony that Peter Damiani gives to the Clergy of the diocese of Turin, when he writes to Cunibert, Archbishop of Turin. He owns, that this Clergy was honest enough, and that they were sufficiently brought up in learning; that when they met with him, they seemed to be an angelic chorus, a choir of angels; and that they shined as a conspicuous senate of their Church. All that obliges him to change this good opinion is only that he was told those Clergymen were married. One cannot enough admire the fury with which he aggravates this pretended crime, neither the care he takes to bear them down with the authority of some Councils; yet after all, he is forced to confess, they defended themselves by the authority of the holy Scripture, and they opposed Councils to Councils, whose authority he could not elude, but by declaring that he acknowledged none for Councils, but those which agreed to the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs. It is an easy matter to reflect upon the vehement accusations they constantly offered, since that time, against the Romish Clergy, with respect to several notorious crimes, in which they lived publicly, being authorized in them by the public custom, or the canons of this communion. Indeed they meet with many proofs of it in the writings of their adversaries, who never were more weak than when they undertake to repulse those reproaches offered to them with so much confidence by the Patarines or Waldenses. But one may be satisfied with the testimony Seisselius, one of the last of their adversaries, gives to them a little before the Reformation.

"They say," saith Seisselius, fol. 14, "that we of the Roman Church open and point out a way to all manner of dissoluteness and lust; they received the order of priesthood against their wills, and opposing themselves against it; whereas we either buy our priesthood with money, or obtain it by force, or by the favor of some temporal prince, and other sinister ways, and for no other end but to satisfy our lusts, to enrich our relations, and to acquire worldly pomp and glory. Moreover, they spent their whole lives in

manifold watchings, fastings, and travels, being neither affrighted with labors or dangers, that so they might point out the way of salvation to the flock committed to them; whereas we spend all our time in idleness, lusts, and other earthly, yea, wicked and ungodly things. They wholly despising gold and silver, as they had freely received, did in like manner administer the divine grace to others; whereas we set all holy things, yea, the very treasures of God's Church, to sale. And in a word, (that I may not insist on all the particulars which, with a most profligate confidence, they upbraid us with,) we confound all things, both human and divine; insomuch, as that this Church of Rome cannot be called the spouse of Christ, but rather that whore, and open prostitute, whom Isaiah, Jeremy, Ezekiel, and John in the Revelation, have set forth in her colors."

This without doubt will be sufficient to prove, that as they have preserved the faith that was committed to them; so have they been as careful to preserve entire amongst them the ancient discipline of the Church, which was in use in those times, which did most closely adhere to the observation of the Canons. But I will go further yet, and evidence,

1. That they derived this their ministry from the ancient Church of Italy.
2. That they never passed for laymen upon any better ground than that of some ridiculous prejudices, the falseness of which the Church of Rome doth at present acknowledge.

Whence it will Follow, in the third place, that nothing can be more false than what is pretended, viz. that they had no kind of lawful ministry amongst them, but that laymen took upon them the power of preaching, of ordaining Ministers, and administering the sacraments.

I say therefore, that these Churches had their ministry from the ancient Churches of the diocese of Italy. To make out this, we need only examine the cause of the separation which the Popes were the occasion of in this diocese, and the manner by which it was effected. It was a very ancient custom for the Clergy to give some money for their ordinations; the Popes had for a long time paid a certain sum of money for their installment; and the eastern Patriarchs in like manner; a custom confirmed by the Novel 123. of Justinian, cap. 1. This custom reached all the Bishops and Priests, yea, the very meanest Clerks, who were obliged to pay a certain sum of money to the Bishop that had ordained them, for inserting their ordination in the registers of the Church; as may be seen in the same Novel, chap. 3. In process of time, when benefices were conferred separate from ordination, the Bishops and laymen that bestowed them introduced the custom of receiving considerable presents from those whom they named to those benefices. The Popes, whose aim was to get all benefices out of the hands of the lay-men, laid hold on this favorable occasion to execute their design. The pretense was very specious: they decried this custom for a real simony; yea, they pushed the matter yet further, by defining it to be an heresy, and maintaining that such ordinations were null and void. This is the notion Petrus Damjanus, Legate of Nicolaus II. gave publicly of this matter in the diocese of Italy, by reordaining, as if they had not been ordained at all, those who confessed themselves to have been ordained and admitted to their benefices after this manner: yea, matters were carried to that height, that they who were of the Pope's party trampled under their feet the sacraments that were administered by these simoniacs, to show their zeal for the Pope's definitions.

This is the first heresy the Popes formed by their definitions. The second heresy the Popes made bore the name of Nicolaitans: this heresy consisted in owning that the Ministers of the Church might be married, and that the celibacy which the Popes at that time endeavored to impose upon Ministers was unjust and tyrannical, directly opposite to the doctrine of the Gospel, and to the use of antiquity; notwithstanding that nothing could be more impure than the celibacy of Ecclesiastics was at that time, insomuch that Petrus Damianus himself, who was one of the great promoters of it, by the authority of Pope Leo IX. was obliged to write a thundering treatise against the sodomy of Ecclesiastics, which then reigned in Italy, as it does still to this day. But notwithstanding all this, the Popes prevailed so against the western Churches, as to this point, that in the end they in a manner wholly carried it. The Clergy who refused to renounce their wives were driven from their benefices; and because they could not wholly obtain their aim by temporal authority, they employed their pretended spiritual one, by darting out excommunication upon excommunication against all married Ministers, and forbidding the people to own their ministry, and declaring the sacraments administered by them to be null and void, and in making them to be looked upon as mere laymen, notwithstanding they had the ordinary vocation that was then to be had. We may easily

imagine how many scruples these excommunications raised, which all of them returned upon the Popes themselves. This we may gather from an answer writ by St. Bruno, Bishop of Ast, which we find at the end of the Life of Leo IX. writ by St. Bruno. The difficulty was this:

"We have already told you, (saith he,) that even from the time of Leo, the Church was so corrupted, that scarcely was any one to be found, who was not either guilty of simony himself, or ordained by those that were so. Wherefore also at this day some are found, who, arguing falsely, and not well understanding the dispensation of the Church, contend, that from that very time the true priesthood has failed in the Church. For, say they, if all were such, that is, either guilty of simony, or ordained by those who were so, you who are now, whence came you, and by whom were you ordained? You must needs derive it from them, for there was no other way; and if so, then they who have ordained us must have received their ordination from them who were either simoniacs themselves, or ordained by such.

This is the question to which we must endeavor to give an answer. And how does he answer this difficulty?

1. He supposeth that the simoniacs no more than other heretics were able to confer the Holy Ghost; and that therefore those who were baptized by them must again pass under the imposition of hands, as if they had been baptized by Arians.
2. He maintains, that the sacraments conferred by simoniacs are null and void, and embraceth the opinion of those who in Gregory VII.'s time obstinately maintained this doctrine, in the case of simoniacs and married Priests.
3. He asserts, that there were always some or other that were not guilty of simony, though perhaps it was not known.

Maurus Marehisio, Dean of Mont Cassin, makes this observation upon the foregoing passage of St. Bruno, in the last page of his second tome, Number 12.

"You proceed (saith he) to the second reason of the deficiency of the book, which we endeavour to defend, which is concerning the sacraments administered by simoniacs and heretics, a which the author maintains to be null and void, and therefore determines, that they are not to be looked upon as good and valid, but ought to be repeated. The author indeed confesseth, that some sacraments of simoniacs and heretics are valid, and need not to be repeated, to wit, those which with a good intent are received from the hand of an unknown simoniac or heretic."

By which means he obviates the calumnies of some, who, from this position, that the sacraments of simoniacs are void, would prove, that the priesthood had failed in the Church ever since the time of Leo IX. because, as he saith, in the life of the same Leo, where he mentions this calumny, that there was scarce one to be found in the Church who was not either a simoniac himself, or ordained by such as were: whence it followed, that if all simoniacal ordination was void, that there was not one true Bishop left in the Church that could confer good and valid Orders, nor any Priest that was duly and lawfully ordained: for they argued thus; If at the time of Leo IX. all were either simoniacs or ordained by such, whence then are you who now are? You must needs derive your ordination from these simoniacs; for there is no other way, for they who ordained you were ordained by them.

Now, to answer this objection, St. Bruno was unwilling to interrupt his narrative of the acts of Leo IX. but promised to do it in a treatise apart, which he accordingly made, and which we here endeavor to answer. Towards the end of treatise he concludes, that these objectors were mistaken, because at that time there were many concealed simoniacs, of whom many received their ordination with a good intent, whose ordination consequently was not void, but valid. But he concludes the contrary, concerning orders conferred by a known simoniac; for those he maintains to be invalid, and that consequently they ought to be repeated. And such he supposeth that some (though not all the) ordinations then were. Now this, though it were written without all doubt by the author, out of his great zeal against the simoniacs, is not to be admitted, except only in that sense wherein most laws declare simoniacal ordinations to be invalid. Which

the doctors expound concerning the nullity of ordination, as to the function and execution of those orders; or as far as they can be made void by the Church, by denying a lawful exercise of orders to a simoniac; or with respect to right or jurisdiction, if the same be necessary to any function; and that it doth appear, that the Church was simoniacally robbed of the same; or lastly, with respect to the obtaining of a benefice, which the Church refuseth to allow as valid, if the same be simoniacally procured. Suarez exactly clears all these points, lib. de Simon. cap. 97. num. 2; but that ordination, though simoniacally conferred, and the Sacrament, though simoniacally administered, in itself considered, is valid, is not at all to be doubted of, as being at large confirmed, not only by Suarez in the same place, num. 3. and 4. but also long since by Bernaldus Presbyter, in his letter to Bernard, the master of the schools at Constance, who was afterwards Monk of Corby in Saxony, and was of the same opinion we here set down: and the same was also the judgment of the famous Guido, (of whom Baronius makes mention ad ann. 1022,) according to the testimony of the same Bernaldus, commending on the other hand Petrus Damianus, who in his book, which he entitles Gratissimus, demonstrates, that ordination may be conveyed by simoniacs and heretics, as well as by others.

Thus we see what pains we must take to make the opinions of the Popish Divines to accord with those of our modern Schoolmen; and if one should endeavor to do it, yet will it be impossible to avoid the consequences of those opinions. And indeed it was only from the sequel of these opinions, which reigned above two hundred years, that the Pope's creatures have pretended, that those who had been deposed in Italy by the unjust laws of Popes were become laics, incapable of administering the sacraments, or imposing of hands; all this so extravagantly, that if once we admit of these principles, it will follow, first, that all those who were ordained by simoniacs were never made Priests; and that those who were ordained by married persons did not receive any sacred Orders: the first of these puts the Church of Rome into a terrible condition; for we defy the most able of their doctors to make it appear that their Popes were not simoniacs; they who have had a like ordination for divers ages, and holding it only from the approbation of the Emperors, either of the east or west. The other is confounded by the confession of the whole Church of Rome, who owns the ministry of the Greek Church to be lawful, as well as of other eastern Churches, where we know that the Ministers have been married, and are so still.

However, thus much is evident,

1. That after the separation of the diocese of Italy, the Bishops, which Rome called heretics, because of their pretended simony, and their being married, continued still in the exercise of their functions, without troubling themselves about the Papal definitions or excommunications.
2. That the reunion of the diocese of Italy with the Pope, about the year 1134, was at the best but very imperfect; they of Milan being very wavering, as may be seen from the 131st epistle of St. Bernard, who was the promoter of that reunion, in order to advance the interest of the Emperor Lotharius against Conrad, and those who took part with Conrad against Lotharius, and who continued in their aversion to the other Papal errors.
3. That these ecclesiastics and people of Italy being thus reduced to a contemptible condition, by reason of their small number, in comparison of the body of the diocese, continued in that separated state, exercising their ministry as formerly they did.
4. That they who had embraced the Papal party looked upon them only as mere laics, who had no authority either to preach the Gospel or administer the sacraments.
5. That after once this charge had been advanced against them, the same was obstinately carried on and continued, upon very ridiculous prejudices, which have been for a long time maintained by the greatest of the Schoolmen; as Morinus proves in his treatise of Ordinations, though at length they have thought fit to quit them.
6. That this charge was fortified by the joining of some of Waldo's disciples with the Churches of Italy, as I have made it appear by the treatise of Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud.

I would conclude this chapter, if I were not aware only of two or three objections that may be made against what I have here alleged; and I think myself bound to prevent them, because they seem to carry some weight along with them.

The first is, that the Bishops of Italy, which by the court of Rome were called schismatics, for their adhering to the interest of the Archbishops of Milan, were so far from espousing the opinions of Berengarius, that the Council of Brixia, which deposed Gregory VII. in the year 1080, mentions this for one of the crimes whereof he was accused; that he was of Berengarius's opinion, as appears from the writings of Cardinal Benno against Gregory VII. and of Conradus Urspergensis.

The second is, that the question of schism being terminated at Milan, by the mediation of St. Bernard in 1134, we do not find that the Bishops of Italy, or of Lombardy in particular, did continue separate from the communion of Rome, it being on the contrary very probable, that they were all of them again reconciled to the same; so that none of them joined with the Patarines, or with those to whom that name was given in the diocese of Italy.

It will be an easy matter to satisfy these objections. As for the first, I own that the Council of Brixia accused Gregory VII. of Berengarianism; but I deny that those of the diocese of Italy constituted the body of that council; the greatest part of those who assisted at it were Germans, who made it their business to follow the footsteps of the Synod of nineteen Bishops, which was held at Mentz the year before upon the same account: neither can it be looked upon as a strange thing, that their business being to depose Gregory VII. who was the great enemy of the diocese of Italy, they should all of them equally concur, without opposition, to have him deposed, for several crimes mentioned in their judgment passed upon him; though some Italians might at the same time believe, that he was unjustly accused of heresy, for embracing the sentiments of Berengarius, from which, as I have elsewhere made out from his commentary upon St. Matthew, he did not seem to be very averse.

Neither is the second difficulty any better grounded. I know well, that after that reunion, the Popes endeavored to their utmost to engage the Bishops of Italy to be of their party, as well as those of Milan, and other lords of the country, who began to disown the power of the Emperors. But they who are versed in the history of those times may easily observe, that the council which condemned Berengarius had been very probably on purpose convened at Verceil, in the diocese of Italy, because there were many Bishops in that country of Berengarius's opinion; Sigebert having taken notice that there were many that pleaded for him, though the overswaying number of his adversaries carried it at last.

They may conclude the same from the printed account we have in the council, instead of the acts of the Roman Council, its 1079, under Gregory VII. against Berengarius. This account we have also in the Chronicle of Verdun, written by Hugo Flaviniacensis, which hath these words: *Omnibus igitur in Ecclesia servatoris congregatis, habitus est sermo de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, nullis hodie, nonnullis illa [prius] sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panem et vinum per sacra orationis verba et sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicum de Virgine nate, quod et in cruce pependit, et in sanguinem qui de ejus latere militis effusus est, lacea, asserebat, [atque autoritatibus orthodoxorum patrum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum modis omnibus defendebat.] Quidam veto caecitate nimia et longa percussi figuram tantum substantiale illud corpus in dextera patris sedens esse, seque et alios decipientes quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi coepit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventura fuerit in Synodo, defuit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti igne emolumenta palearum consurnens, et fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans noctis callinem vertit in lucem.*

This is the account of what was done in that council; and it appears from the MS. of the council which I have examined, that those who published it have altered it just as they pleased themselves.

Now, whatever pains they may have taken in this matter, yet it is manifest, first, that Berengarius was not the first author of this opinion in Italy, from whence the greatest part of those Bishops were summoned to the council by Gregory VII. Secondly, That this council was at first mightily divided, and that division lasted for two days, and was not taken up till the third day. Thirdly, That the word of long blindness, which the author of this account speaks of, could not be referred to the disciples of Berengarius, but to those

who maintained the same doctrine with him in Italy, since the contrary doctrine being set forth by Paschasius Radbertus gave occasion to the division upon that matter, of which Joannes Scotus's book, that was burnt in Vetceil, was an authentic testimony.

Moreover, they cannot be ignorant how that diocese was laid waste by the forces of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, which gave occasion to the Clergy to enjoy a greater liberty in their opinions, the four Anti-popes, who succeeded one another, troubling themselves about little else but who should have the mastery; and those who are looked upon as the true Popes being not in a condition to concern themselves with ought but what might be for their own defense against the Anti-popes, who were supported by that Emperor.

The third objection is this: that whatsoever has been said, we cannot point to those precisely who have succeeded to the Bishops, who separated themselves in this diocese of Italy from the communion with the Popes, since the year 1134, when the diocese of Milan was reconciled with them by the endeavors of St. Bernard.

But yet, as I remarked before, this is very clear, that there was nothing but an horrid disorder and confusion in that diocese, by the intrigues of the Popes, and by the resistance of the Emperors.

Whosoever will look only on the succession of the Bishops of Milan, in those times, will meet with so great uncertainty in their succession, many pretending to the same title, that there was nothing more common in that diocese, than questions upon elections of Bishops, or other clergymen.

Those who, as Ughellus, look upon the confirmation of the Pope as an essential thing to make an election lawful, are forced to look upon many of the Bishops of this diocese as intruders and schismatics, that gave occasion to the Popes to declare these ordinations null and void, and to deprive them of the name of Bishops, Priest, and Deacons.

As since that time those who favored the Popish interest declared war against those that were ordained against their consent, and had their ordination from those who were rejected by the Romish party as heretics and schismatics; we ought not to be surprised, if when Rome considered them as lay-men, they on the contrary may pretend to have a true ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, though in the consequence of time they thought fit to conceal their titles, to avoid, as well as they could, the hatred and persecution which those titles brought upon them from the Church of Rome and her Inquisitors.

It is known to all the world how careful the abettors of the Roman party have been to destroy the last monument of those Churches which they reduced under their yoke. If we reflect upon England only, we shall have too sensible instances of this care.

St. Asaph was Bishop of the church called by his name, and St. Daniel was Bishop of Bangor; we know that these lived in the time of Austin the Monk, and they do not doubt that they were two of the seven that opposed his usurpation; Bede, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2:2. But from that time till the English Conquest, (which was above five hundred years after,) they cannot find the name of any one of their successors, nor any name of any one Churchman in that diocese. The Bishop of Bangor cannot name three of his predecessors in that time. But of this we find sufficient proof, that all the records of these churches were destroyed by the English at the time of that conquest; and we do not doubt that they took especial care to extinguish all the memory of these Bishops' opposition to Popery, which we can plainly and certainly prove did not prevail in that country till the English Conquest.

CHAPTER 25

Concerning the persecutions which the Waldenses have suffered since the eleventh century.

We have given an account of the true rise of the name of the Patarines and of the Waldenses; but that true original of the word was soon after thrust out by another: for, before the end of the twelfth century, the name Patarine passed for a word derived from the Latin word *pati*, because of the great sufferings to which the believers of Italy found themselves exposed by the violence of the Popes and Emperors, who had abandoned their power to the Popes, to exterminate and root out whatsoever opposed itself against their authority.

And the same happened to the word Vallenses, which signified no more than inhabitants of the valleys; which their enemies would needs derive from Waldo, and which at last they imposed upon the Vaudois, as living in the Valley of Tears, according to the derivation which Everard of Bethune gives us of that name. Indeed it must be acknowledged, that New Rome has carried the art of persecuting much beyond any thing that Old Rome ever arrived to, though she seemed to have attained the mastery of that art, after the ten persecutions which she carried on against the Christians. To judge of this, we need only take notice of some laws which have served for a rule to the persecutors, how they were to behave themselves therein. The first law I have here set down is equally levelled against the Patarines and the Poor of Lyons, maliciously confounding them with the Manichees, that so they might appear the more execrable in the eyes of the people. It was published by Pope Lucius III. Cap. *ad abolendam*.

THE DECREE OF POPE LUCIUS III. AGAINST HERETICS.

"To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies, which of late time are sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the Church should be awakened, that by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and impertinence of the heretics, in their false designs, may be crushed, and the truth of catholic simplicity shining forth in the holy Church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son Frederick, the most illustrious Emperor of the Romans, always Increaser of the Empire, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other Patriarchs, Archbishops, and many princes, who from several parts of the world are met together, do set ourselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines they profess, by the sanction of this present general Decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

"More particularly we declare all Cathari, Patarines, and those who call themselves the Humbled, or Poor of Lyons, Passagines, Josephines, Arnoldists, to lie under a perpetual anathema: and because some under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the Apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching, whereas the same Apostle saith, How shall they preach, except they be sent? we therefore conclude under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema all those who either being forbid or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received either from the apostolic see, or from the Bishops of their respective dioceses; as likewise all those who are not afraid to hold or teach any opinions concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, baptism, the remission of sins, matrimony, or any other sacraments of the Church, differing from what the holy Church of Rome doth preach and observe; and generally all those who the same Church of Rome, or the several Bishops in their dioceses, with the advice of their Clergy, or the Clergy themselves, in case of a vacancy of the see, with the advice, if need be, of neighboring Bishops, shall judge to be heretics. And we likewise declare all entertainers and defenders of the said heretics, and those that have showed any favor, or given countenance to them, thereby strengthening them in their heresy, whether they be called Comforted,

Bellowers, or Perfect, or with whatsoever superstitious names they disguise themselves, to be liable to the same sentence.

"And though it sometimes happens, that the severity of ecclesiastical discipline, necessary to the coercion of sin, is condemned by those who do not understand the virtue of it, we notwithstanding by these presents decree, that whosoever shall be notoriously convicted of these errors, if a Clergyman, or one that endeavors to conceal himself under any religious order, he shall be immediately deprived of all prerogative of the Church orders, and so being divested of all office and benefice, be delivered up to the secular power, to be punished according to demerit, unless, immediately upon his being detected, he voluntarily returns to the truth of the Catholic faith, and submits publicly to abjure his errors, at the discretion of the Bishop of the diocese, and to make suitable satisfaction. And as for a layman who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately returns to the orthodox faith; we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of his offense.

"And as for those who are taken notice of by the Church, as suspected of heresy, except at the Bishop's command they give full evidence of their innocence, according to the degree of suspicion against them, and quality of their persons, they shall all be liable to the same sentence. But those who after having abjured their errors, or cleared themselves upon examination, to their Bishop, shall be found to have relapsed into their abjured heresy; we decree, that without any further hearing they be forthwith delivered up to the secular power, and their goods confiscated to the use of the Church.

"And we further decree, that this excommunication, in which our will is, that all heretics be included, be by all Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, renewed and repeated in all the chief festivals, and on any public solemnity, or upon any other occasion, to the glory of God, and the putting a stop to all heretical pravity; ordering by our apostolical authority, that if any Bishop be found wanting or slow herein, he be suspended for three years from his episcopal dignity and administration.

"Furthermore, with the counsel and advice of Bishops, and intimation of the Emperor and Princes of the empire, we do add, that every Archbishop or Bishop, either in his own person, or by his Archdeacon, or by other honest and fit persons, shall once or twice in the year visit the parish in which it is reported that heretics dwell, and there cause two or three men of good credit, or, if need be, the whole neighborhood, to swear, that if they know of any heretics there, or any that frequent private meetings, or differ from the common conversation of mankind, either in life or manners, they will signify the same to the Bishop or Archdeacon: the Bishop also or Archdeacon shall summon before them the parties accused, who, except they at their discretion, according to the custom of the country, do clear themselves of the guilt laid to their charge; or if, after having so cleared themselves, they relapse again to their former unbelief, shall be punished at the Bishop's discretion. And if any of them, by a damnable superstition, shall refuse to swear, that alone shall suffice to make them heretics convict, and liable to the punishments before mentioned.

"We ordain further, that all earls, barons, governors, and consuls of cities, and other places, in pursuance of the commonition of the respective Archbishops and Bishops, shall promise upon oath, that in all these particulars, whenever they are thereto required, they will powerfully and effectually assist the Church against heretics and their complices, and endeavor faithfully, according to their office and power, to execute the ecclesiastical and imperial statutes concerning the matters herein mentioned.

"But if any of them shall refuse to observe this, they shall be deprived of their honors and charges, and be rendered incapable of receiving others, and moreover be involved in the sentence of excommunication, and their goods be confiscated to the use of the Church. And if any city shall refuse to yield obedience to these decretal constitutions; or that, contrary to the episcopal commonition, they shall neglect to punish opposers; we ordain the same to be excluded from all commerce with other cities, and to be deprived of the episcopal dignity.

"We likewise decree, that all favorers of heretics, as men stigmatized with perpetual infamy, shall be incapable of being attorneys or witnesses, or of bearing any public office whatsoever. And as for those who are exempt from the law of diocesan jurisdiction, as being immediately under the jurisdiction of the apostolic see; nevertheless, as to these constitutions against heretics, we will, that they be subject to the

judgment of the Archbishop and Bishops, and that in this case they yield obedience to them, as to the delegates of the apostolic see, the immunity of their privileges notwithstanding."

Ildephonsus also, King of Arragon, testified his zeal against the Waldenses, by his edict published in the year 1194, which was printed by Pegna, in his notes upon the Directory of Inquisitors.

THE EDICT OF KING ILDEPHONSUS AGAINST THE WALDENSAN HERETICS, COMMANDING THEM TO DEPART HIS KINGDOM.

"Ildephonsus, by the grace of God, King of Arragon, Earl of Barcelona, Marquess of Provence, to all Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates of the Church of God, Earls, Viscounts, Knights, and to all people of his kingdom, or belonging to his dominions, wisheth health, and the sound observance of Christian religion.

"Forasmuch as it has pleased God to set us over his people, it is but fit and just, that according to our might we should be continually solicitous for the welfare and defense of the same; wherefore we, in imitation of our ancestors, and obedience to the Canons, which determine and ordain heretics, as persons east out from the sight of God and all Catholics, to be condemned and persecuted every where; do command and charge the Waldenses, Inzabbati, who otherwise are called the Poor of Lyons, and all other heretics, who cannot be numbered, being excommunicated from the holy Church, adversaries to the cross of Christ, violaters and corrupters of the Christian religion, and the avowed enemies of us and our kingdom, to depart out of our kingdom and all our dominions. Whosoever therefore from this day forwards shall presume to receive the said Waldenses and Zapatati, or any other heretics, of whatsoever profession, into their houses, or to be present at their pernicious sermons, or to afford them meat, or any other favour, shall incur thereby the indignation of Almighty God, as well as ours, and have his goods confiscated, without the remedy of an appeal, and be punished as if he were actually guilty of high treason. And we strictly charge and command, that this our edict and perpetual constitution be publicly read on the Lord's days by the Bishops and other Rectors of churches, in all the cities, castles, and towns of our kingdom, and throughout all our dominions: and that the same be observed by Vicars, Bailiffs, Justices, Merins, and Zenalroedins, and all the people in general; and the aforesaid punishment be inflicted upon all transgressors. "We will further, that if any person, noble or ignoble, shall in any part of our dominions find any of these wicked wretches, who shall be known to have had three days' notice of this our edict, that do not forthwith depart, but rather obstinately staying or lingering, shall any way plague, despitefully use, or distress them, (wounding unto death, and maiming of them only excepted,) he will, in so doing, act nothing but what will be very grateful and pleasing to us, and shall be so far from fearing to incur any penalty thereby, that he may be sure rather to deserve our favor. Furthermore, we do afford to these wicked miscreants respite (though this may in some sort seem contrary to our duty and reason) till the day after All Saints day; but that all those who either shall not be gone by that time, or at least preparing for their departure, shall be spoiled, beaten, cudgelled, and shamefully and ill entreated.

"The seal of Ildephonsus, King of Arragon, Earl of Barcelona, and Marquess of Provence. The seal of Peter, King of Arragon, and Earl of Barcelona, in the original of this paper. And the seal of Lord Regimund, Archbishop of Tarfacona, and Lord G. Bishop of Tirassona, and Lord R. Bishop of Jacca. This was copied at Ilerda by William de Bastia, the King's notary, ann. Dom. 1194. and compared with the original; witness Martinus de Seribas, notary."

Innocent III. caused search to be made after them in all places. We have a letter of his, writ to those of Metz, where he ordains them to be driven out and persecuted with the extremest barbarity, because they took the liberty to read the Scripture translated by Peter Waldo into the vulgar tongue. Honorius III. obliged the Emperor Frederick II. to publish that terrible law which we find at the end of the book De Feudis, in the civil law, and which has since served for a rule to the Inquisitors, as well as given them their authority. Which law is as follows:

"Frederick, by the grace of God, Emperor of the Romans, always Increaser of the Empire, to all Marquesses, Earls, and all people under our government, health and grace.

"Forasmuch as nothing can conduce more to the honor of the empire and praise of the Emperor, than by the purging away of error, and the abrogating of some unjust statutes, to procure the peaceable and flourishing state of the Church of God, and secure her liberty:

"We do condemn to perpetual infamy the Cathari, Patarines, Leonists, Speronists, Arnoldists, Circumcised, and all other heretics of both sexes, by what names soever they are called, commanding their goods to be confiscated, so as never to return to them again, or by way of inheritance to devolve to their children; since it is a much more heinous crime to offend the majesty of the eternal God, than any temporal prince. And as for those who are only suspected of heresy, except at the command of the Church, according to the degree of suspicion and quality of the person, they make their innocence to appear by a sufficient vindication of themselves, shall be accounted infamous and outlawed; and if they continue so for a whole year, we condemn them for heretics.

"We also ordain by this perpetual edict, that all that are in authority, Consuls and Rectors, whatsoever their office may be, do publicly take an oath, for defense of the faith, that they will faithfully endeavor, to the utmost of their power, to exterminate all heretics in the places subject to their jurisdiction; so that from henceforward, as soon as any one shall be taken into any place of power, either perpetual or temporary, he shall be obliged to swear to this article; and that in case of failure, they shall neither be accounted persons in power or consuls; and we from thenceforward declare all their acts and sentences null and void. "And in case that any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territories from heretical pravity, after a whole year elapsed from the time of his admonition, we give leave to Catholics to possess themselves of his lands, who, after having rooted out the heretics, shall quietly possess the same, and preserve it in piety. Provided always that the rights of the principal lord of the fee be preserved but that the foresaid law shall be wholly in force against those who have no such superior lords of the fee.

"Moreover, we proscribe all heretics, entertainers and favorers of heretics, firmly ordaining, that as soon as any such, being excommunicated by the Church, shall contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within a year's time, that then he be made infamous by law, and incapable of any office, or of being a member of any council, or of having a voice in the choice of officers, or being a witness: that moreover he be deprived of the power of making a will, and of succeeding into an inheritance. Furthermore, that nobody shall be bound to answer to his complaint or charge, but he be obliged to answer the charge of others against him: and if he be a judge, that his sentence be of no force, and that no causes be brought before him; if he be a lawyer, that his pleading be not admitted; and if a scrivener, that the writings drawn up by him be invalid.

"And we Honorius, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, do praise, approve, and confirm these laws, to continue for ever, which are made by Frederick, Emperor of the Romans, our dearest son, for the good of all Christians. And in case any man, by a presumptuous attempt, being instigated thereto by the enemy of mankind, shall any way endeavor the infraction of them, let him be assured, that by so doing he will incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul."

We may take a guess from hence of the miseries these Christians have been exposed to, who from the time of these bloody edicts scarce enjoyed the least interval of rest. And we may add also the settling of the Inquisition, which was introduced with the title of an office by Gregory IX. They who will take the pains to consult the Annals of the Church of Rome will find, that from the thirteenth century her purple hath been dyed in the blood of the Waldenses and Patarines. The primitive Christian Church suffered ten persecutions, but most of them at considerable intervals, and their whole continuance was not at the most above two hundred and fifty years; and it hath been demonstrated, that the number of the martyrs was not excessive. But Rome now can vaunt itself to have almost continually maintained a persecution against these Churches of Italy, and to have carried it on to that degree, that there are none of them now to be found in their own country, except those she locks up in her dungeons, and reserves for capital punishments.

My design is not to draw the picture of these cruelties, since Rome has monopolized the trade of persecution; he that would undertake this, ought to be furnished with the registers of the Inquisitors, who have been the executioners of the bloody sentences of that tribunal, in all the places where the Churches of Piedmont have spread their faith, by planting of their colonies. I shall only make some few observations upon this matter, which may give us a compendious view of the horridness of the Inquisitors' proceedings.

First, They have not omitted any cruelty, whereby they might find a pretense of running them down, as persons of most abominable lives. They have put them to tortures in vast numbers, both men and women, to force them to confess, that in their assemblies they committed filthiness against nature. Hereof we have an illustrious example in Perrin, chapter 7 which is a pregnant proof that the spirit of Paganism is by transmigration passed into the Church of Rome.

Secondly, They have made use of a devilish cheat, to make people believe that they were guilty by their own confession. There is a memorable example of this in the year 1487, recorded by Perrin, chapter 3 in these words:

"I took notice of an extraordinary piece of villainy in a process formed by the Monk Veiletty; for having the aforesaid process in my hand, we found the short billets in which the aforesaid commissary took the answers of the accused simply, as they came from his mouth; but we have found them afterwards enlarged in the process, and often quite contrary to what was taken from his mouth, by changing the intention of the accused, and making him say those things of which he never thought. As for example; when he was asked, whether he believes, that after the words in the sacrament of the Mass, pronounced by the Priest, the body of Christ was in the Host, large and extended, as it was upon the cross; and the Vaudois answered, that it was not; Viletty framed his answer thus: That he had confessed that he did not believe in God; or at the least his scribe by his order. Also they asked him, if the saints were to be invocated; he answered, not: and they framed it in writing, that he had cursed and spoke evil of the saints. He was asked, if the Virgin Mary was to be worshipped, and to be prayed unto in our necessity; he answered, no: they write, that he had spoken blasphemy against the Virgin Mary."

Behold the fidelity of the aforesaid Monk's Inquisitors, of so important an action.

This was not without a considerable providence of God, that the memory of these wickednesses have been preserved unto this present, that it may be seen with what spirit they were acted, who, having the power of killing and destroying, made use of such impostures, to make them more odious under the burden of such calamities.

Perrin gives an account how he was informed of those villainies; that when Ambrum was taken in the year 1588, by the Mareschal of Lesdiguières, those processes that were kept in original in the house of the Bishop, were obtained from a famous man, Calignon, Chancellor of Navarra, and were put in the hands of M. Wulqon, Counsellor in the parliament of Grenoble, from whom he had a view of them.

Those processes were put afterwards in the hand of Mr. Morland, and are now in the public library of the University of Cambridge, from whence I thought fit to make an extract in the next chapter, and at the end of this book to justify what was asserted by Perrin with so much assurance. The reader may compare the billet and the process, and thereby judge of the honesty of the Inquisitors, and whether I was obliged to review with concern such villainous and wicked calumnies.

Thirdly, They have employed the fury of soldiers, and the cruelty of executioners to root them out.

Fourthly, These great accusers of the Waldenses, as being unclean and filthy people, have made use of the Inquisition to ravish their wives and their daughters; as one may see in the history of Perrin, chapter 7. Fifthly, They have exercised their cruelties even upon those whom the rage of the most barbarous wars is wont to spare, old men, women, and sucking children.

Sixthly, They have involved in the same punishments with them, all those who spoke the least word in favor of them: as may be seen in many instances.

Seventhly, They have obliged princes to break the treaties they had made with this poor people, when, forced by the extremity of their violences, they undertook their own defense, forcing their adversaries to come to a treaty with them.

Those that are desirous to be more particularly informed concerning the behavior of the Inquisitors, need only peruse their Directory printed at Rome, 1593 by order of Gregory XIII. and from thence may easily judge how they behaved themselves in the persecution of these poor Christians in 1375 which Spondanus mentions; in that of 1380, stirred up by Borelli the Monk, mentioned by Leger; in that of 1400, set down by the same author; in that of 1160, which he mentions, which continued until the year 1487, under the conduct of the Franciscan Friar Veyletti; in that of 1488, under Innocent VIII. carried on by Albert de Capitaneis, and continued by Plorreri, a Franciscan, mentioned by Leger; in that of 1494 managed by Antonius Fabry; in that of 1506, under Lewis XII.; in that of 1532, by Pantalcon Berser, mentioned by Leger; in the year 1540, and 1541, in which were involved those of Cabrieres, Merindol, and the neighboring places; in the years 1560, and 1561, and I do not know in how many more, which are mentioned by the Jacobins in the annals of their order. But we may form a truer judgment of their sufferings, by four very memorable new instances, the first of which is, the desolation and destruction of the churches of Pragela in Dauphind, in the year 1545, under Francis I. The history of the destruction of Cabrieres and Merindol is as remarkable and notorious in France as the Parisian massacre. Sleidan hath writ the history of it in his book, and Thuanus has confirmed whatever he has writ concerning it. The speech of Monsieur Aubery de Maurier, attorney of the French King, touching the same matter, is still in being, which is capable of drawing tears from the eyes of cannibals themselves, and the most enraged dragoons.

The second is, the destruction of their churches in Bohemia, by Ferdinand II.; whereof we have an account printed in 1648.

The third is, the persecution, or rather desolation, which happened in 1655, in our days, and which is set down by Sir Samuel Morland, and Monsieur Leger, Pastor of those Valleys.

The fourth is, the business of 1686, which caused the total ruin of those churches, and the dispersion of the inhabitants of the Valleys: a short account whereof was printed at the Theatre at Oxford, in 1688.

CHAPTER 26

An instance of the calumnies of some Inquisitors.

The account given by an Inquisitor, in one of the foregoing chapters, of the belief and conduct of the Waldenses, clearly proves the intolerable impudence of those who have charged them with horrid and detestable calumnies, both as to faith and manners. But because some may be imposed upon by the informations against the Waldenses, where their aim was to expose them, and to make them odious; I am willing to give here an instance of the honesty and upright dealing of those cruel Inquisitors, as of a second kind of persecution against them. And though these following informations, which I am to describe, were taken in Dauphind, yet they wholly respect the Waldenses, because it is an acknowledged truth, that the inhabitants of Dauphind were a colony of those of Piedmont; as was evident to the Sieur du Bellay Langey, when he went thither to take informations concerning the massacre committed by the president D'Opede, by order from Francis I.

See here an extract of two examinations taken in the year 1492; let the reader compare them, and judge if the Inquisitors have not perfectly imitated the way of the old persecutors, in calumniating the primitive Christians.

In the year of our Lord 1492, the 2nd of August, at Ulcy, the venerable Bartholomew Pasohal, Canon, and Pidancerius, and Vicar of the Reverend Travellis, Vicar General of the most Reverend Father in God, and Lord John Michael, by Divine mercy Bishop of Praeneste, Cardinal of St. Angelo, Administrator and Commendator of the famous monastery of Ulcy, in company of the worthy and worshipful Poncius, of Ponci, Counsellor to the Lord of Dauphind, and Orancius Eme, Judge of Embrun, did proceed to the examination of Francis de Girondino, of Spoleto, called Barba Martinus, at that time a prisoner in the prison of Ulcy in Dauphine. First, he said, that about sixteen years ago, Girondinus, his father, taught him the faith and heresy of the Waldenses, and began to lead him up and down the countries.

Being asked through what countries he led him, he answered, through these several countries of Italy, Genoua, Bononia, Lucca, Monte Martio, and Ancona; and that his father himself, who was a Barba, went to teach and preach to the inhabitants of those mountains.

Being farther asked, with whom he associated, and in what places, and with whom he continued and conversed, he said, that after the second year he went to learn the said doctrine of the Waldenses, in company of another Barba, called Barnovo, who was originally of the country about the lake of Perugia, in the lordship of Camarino, who led him up and down the aforesaid places for two or three years together.

Being asked, whether after that the said Barnovo had left him he still followed the same doctrine, he said, that afterwards he kept company with another Barba, called Josue, of Saneto Loeo, in the said lordship of Camarino, about three miles distant from Charretto; saying further, that after he had accompanied the said Josue, to profess and preach the said sect in the aforesaid places, another Barba, called Andreas, led him to their great master, who was called John Anthony, who has his residence in the town of Cambro, belonging to the Pope's dominions.

Being asked what the said great master had said to him, saith, that he enjoined him to take an oath, according to their faith, and commanded him further, that he should not, for any thing of the world, reveal or manifest what he should say to him, telling him, that to manifest or reveal their faith was an unpardonable sin; adding, that if he would keep firm to that sect, and follow it, he would do much good.

Being asked, whether there were any more of those they called Barbae, he said, there were; and that their great master himself was called Barba, and said, that they all held the same sect, and that very secretly.

And he further said, that their great master, who exhorted them to keep their faith, and they should be saved, also preached to them, that all who should follow their faith were saved; but that those who did not follow it were damned.

Being demanded which was the chief foundation of their sect, he said, that their great master declared, and that their Barbae found it so in wandering up and down the world; that because of the wicked and most profligate lives of the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, religious, and all other ecclesiastical persons, the Barbas follow this their faith, and meet with an infinite number of followers; because the said Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, and ecclesiastics are leaders, and the people follow them in avarice, luxury, pride, pomp, gluttony, and anger, and that this is the life of all ecclesiastics; and that the wicked and profligate lives of the Clergy was the chiefest motive of their separation.

Saying further, that the Clergy living thus in mortal sin, cannot administer the sacraments; and that whatever they do is of no efficacy; for when they are made Priests, they swear chastity, purity, and virginity; but committing the aforesaid sins, they break their faith and oath, and so become the enemies of faith, and lose all virtue and power; because, when a burning candle is put out and dead, it can no more enlighten and quicken another.

He saith further, that there is not a Pope, Cardinal, Bishop, or other Clergyman, that keeps not his miss, or his regesco, to lie with him. Saying further, that his said great master charged them to preach and enlarge their faith, and to draw the people as much as in them lay to it, because in so doing they should gain eternal life, because all of their faith were saved, and the rest damned.

He saith, that when their great master, having called together the community, has made them Barbae, and given them power, he changeth their names; and that before that he was made a Barba by their aforesaid community, he was called Francis, but that afterwards he was called Martin.

He saith further, that the Barbra are made or constituted, and there is an office or charge belonging to them; and that as soon as any one dies, another is substituted in his room.

Being asked, whether they had any particular provinces in which they exercised their office, he answered, no; but that they go up and down the world preaching.

Being asked what further charge their great master laid upon them, and what the Barbae were used to preach in their journeyings up and down, he answered, that he said, and they were wont to preach, that one God alone is to be worshipped, who created heaven and earth, the sun, moon, and stars, and water: and that

Being asked what their great master told them [the Barbrae] concerning the saints, and what they preach concerning them, he said, that they believe in St. Peter, and next him in St. Gregory, and St. Sylvester, and in St. John the Evangelist; but in St. Paul they do not believe, because he was an assassin.

Being asked why they rather believe in St. Peter than in St. Paul, he saith, because God hath made the said St. Peter his Vicar or Vicegerent, and given him the power of loosing and binding; and because St. Peter in his lifetime wrought miracles, therefore they believe in him amongst the rest.

Being asked what miracles St. Peter wrought, he saith, that when St. Peter caused the church of St. Peter to be built at Rome, the Devil came to him, and said, I will cause a fairer building to be built than you can, and in shorter time, and that he would do it by the next day; and a little while after, the Devil came to St. Peter, and said, Come to the house that I have made but when you enter, be sure you do not make the sign of the cross. And so St. Peter came to take a view of the said house, and when he was in sight of the said house, which is now called Sancta Maria de rotunda, with caution he made the sign of the cross, laying his hand on his beard, and saying, By this holy beard; and then laying his hand on his stomach, and saying, By this holy fountain; and then on his right and left arm, saying, By these shoulders, this is a fair building; and having, as was said just now, made the sign of the cross, the Devil would have destroyed the house, but St. Peter hindered him, and adjured him; and because St. Peter was got within the doors of the church, the Devil could not get out by the door, but striking his feet against the ground he left the mark

of his footsteps, and went out by a hole which he made in the top of the church, which hole is there still, and could never since be closed: and for the said miracle, which he wrought openly to the eye, they believe in St. Peter, but do not believe in the other saints, because they were sinners, and because they have not seen any of their miracles.

Concerning St. John the Baptist, he said, that because he did not desire grace of the Lord, he is expected, and that in the day of judgment he shall intercede for all; and that it is not known whether he be in heaven or on earth, but that he believed he was in the terrestrial paradise.

He saith further, that they believe in the angels, archangels, cherubims, and seraphims because they were created of God the Father in eternal life. Concerning the Virgin Mary, he saith, that, because God alone is to be worshipped, and that we are not sure that the Virgin Mary hears our prayers, because she was a human creature, and because Hail Mary is not a prayer, but an annunciation and salutation, therefore they do not impose it for a penance on those who are of their sect. And, that the Lord's Prayer is the only true prayer, as being a prayer made by God himself.

Concerning purgatory, he saith, that there is no such place, but the Clergy, out of covetousness, have invented it, to extort money from the people for masses and prayers for the dead, which are of no profit, because as soon as a man is dead, he is either saved or damned.

Concerning holy water, he saith, that they do preach, say, and believe, that every year, in the month of May, on Ascension-day, God blesseth the heaven, earth, water, herbs, rivers, fountains, and all fruits; and that this blessing may be more securely relied on than that which proceeds from the Priest, because their blessing is of no force, except they be pure, and free from sin, and because for the most part Priests are sinners, as he said before. For these reasons they have no faith in the sacraments administered by Clergymen.

Saying moreover, that one may as well pray in a stable as in the church, because God is everywhere.

Concerning holydays, he saith, that such as are appointed by God, as the Lord's day, our Savior's Nativity, Easter, Ascension, and Whit-Sunday, are to be kept; but as for the feasts of the blessed Virgin, and of the saints, no man is obliged to observe them, except he please, because they are not enjoined by God: nor is any one bound to fast upon the vigils of those holydays.

Concerning the body of Christ, they say, that because the Clergy are wicked, of most profligate lives, and great sinners, they cannot consecrate the body of our Lord, nor is their consecration of any virtue. Therefore the Barbie of their sect do not receive the Eucharist, but instead thereof, they bless the bread, and say, that this blessing is of greater virtue and efficacy than the consecration of the Priests, because as much goodness and holiness as a man hath, so much virtue and power he hath, and no more. Concerning the sin of the flesh, he saith, that as they go up and down the world preaching, they frequent nocturnal meetings and assemblies, where, after that their Barbra have preached, they begin to feast and make merry, and dance, running up and down through one another, without holding hands together, and this by candlelight. That after their feasting and merriment, some one of the company, though it be not known who, puts out the candle; whereupon they all apply themselves to act filthiness with whomsoever they first meet with, without any regard had to father, mother, daughter, or any thing else. And they say, that in case in this filthy action any sons be begotten, that they will be the fitter to discharge the duty and function of Barbae, and of preachers and confessors, than others, as being begot in their assemblies. This done, every one leaves the assembly.

Saying moreover, that such assemblies as these are kept every year in every parish; and that the Barba, who is of the parish in which the meeting is held, is present at it, because his parents are of the same. But if he be not of the same parish, then he preacheth, and afterwards leaves them to make their synagogue between them, because he should not mingle with his parents, neither doth he settle himself in that parish, except his parents go away.

The rest I have not set down, as being very frivolous things; as, what he said concerning swearing, that nobody ought to swear, and that they never swear amongst themselves, neither truly nor falsely, as accounting it a mortal sin.

He saith moreover, that no man ought to be put to death for any fault, how great soever it may be, except for murder.

He saith further, that when their Barbae are created by their companions, the great master assembling the rest of the Barbae together, as was said before, they then take this oath as follows: Thou (such an one) swear upon thy faith to maintain, multiply, and increase our law, and not to discover the same to any person in the world; and here promise that thou wilt not swear by God in any manner, but observe the Lord's day; and that thou wilt not do any thing to thy neighbor, which thou wouldest not have him do to thee; and that thou dost believe in, God, who has made the sun and moon, cherubim and seraphim, and all that thou seest, etc. I have put this whole interrogatory at the end of this book.

The other instance of the sincerity of those honest Inquisitors is to be seen in the process of Peironetta, a widow; of which I judged fit to give here this extract to the reader.

Peironetta, the relict of Peter Beraud, made her appearance before Anthony Fabri, Doctor of the Canon of Embrun, Inquisitor General after heresy throughout all Dauphine, and the counties of Vienne, Valence, and Die, specially thereto deputed by the holy apostolic see; and Christopher de Sabien, Doctor of Laws, Canon, Vicar, and Official of Valence, at the instance and prosecution of the worshipful Valettrinus de, Professor of Laws, Solicitor and Fiscal of Valence, being in this case a promoter in favor of the holy Catholic faith, and of the deputies of the office of Inquisition, against Peironetta, etc.

To the first interrogatory she answered nothings and therefore I have only set down what she answered to the second and third interrogatories. To the second interrogatory she said and confessed, "That about twenty-five years ago or thereabouts, there came to the house of Peter Fornerius, her husband, two strangers, in gray clothes, who, as it seemed to her, spake Italian, or the language of Lombardy, whom her husband received into his house for the love of God. That whilst they were there at night after supper, one of them began to read a godly book, which he carried about with him, saying, that therein were contained the Gospels, and other precepts of the law; and said, that he would expound and preach the same in the presence of all that were present; saying, that he was sent by God to reform the Catholic faith, going up and down the world, like the Apostles, to preach to good and simple people the manner and way how they ought to worship God, and live according to his commands. And that amongst other things they declared, that nobody ought to do any thing to others, which he would not be willing they should do to him."

"Also, That God alone is to be served, worshipped, and prayed to, because it is he alone that can help us."

"That to swear upon any occasion whatsoever, whether for truth or falsehood, or any oath whatsoever, wherein the word by is used, was a great sin."

"That the sacrament of matrimony was to be faithfully and firmly kept."

"That the good works which are done before death, are of far greater profit and advantage, than those that are done after death."

"That no saints whatever, whether men or women, were to be prayed to for help, because none could assist us in any thing, but God alone."

"That the Lord's day ought to be solemnly kept and observed above all other holydays, because all other holydays were enjoined by the Church, which therefore were not of absolute necessity to be observed; yea, that a man might work on them, except the

festivals of the Apostles, and other greater saints, which they did not particularly express."

"That the Clergy possessed money, riches, and goods, beyond what they ought to do, and that they committed many evils; and that by reason of the superfluity of their riches some of them were fornicators, others usurers, proud, and covetous; others again lived dissolutely and dishonestly, kept whores in their houses publicly and openly, and by this means gave a bad example to the people."

"That these Priests, by reason of their wicked lives, had no greater power to absolve, than the preachers and masters of that sect had; yea, that their masters and preachers, though laymen, had as much power as the Priests."

"That the holy Pope, because he did not observe the holiness he ought, had no power at all, saying of him, that he was as bad as any of the rest, and consequently had no power at all."

"That there was no purgatory in the other world, saying, that when any one dies, his soul immediately goes to paradise, if he have lived well and justly; but if wickedly, to hell."

"That consequently all prayers and intercessions for the dead were in vain; and that all that the Priests did, signified nothing; as their sprinkling holy water on the graves, and saying, Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison; Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us."

"That God, in the beginning of the world, blessed all waters, and all other things that he had made; and that therefore there was no need for the Priests to bless them a second time, which indeed was then no better than other water."

"That the said Priests had invented purgatory, that by singing and praying for the dead, they might get store of money to maintain their dissolute and luxurious lives."

"That it is better and more meritorious to give alms to the poor, sick, and leprous, than to offer it in the church to the Priests, who had too much already."

"That it was as good, and equally advantageous, to pray to God in a house or elsewhere, as in the church, because God is everywhere."

"That though holy men and women were for their good works placed in paradise, yet had they no power to assist or help us in any thing; and that therefore they ought not to be prayed unto to help us."

"That it was a vain thing to have recourse to the images of the saints, by praying before them, as having no power at all, being only material things, or pictures made upon walls."

"That for the same reason it was a vain thing to go on pilgrimage to Rome, or elsewhere, to pray there before the images of holy men and women, as not being able to help us."

"That it was not necessary to fast upon the vigils of any holydays, except those of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and some other greater festivals; and that on Fridays especially they ought to fast."

"That the preachers, and masters of their sect, and the Priests, or Clergymen, were formerly of one and the same order and degree; but that when the Clergy began to follow after covetousness and the vanities of this world, and their preachers resolved to continue in their first poverty; by this means a division and separation happened amongst them, and the Clergy became their enemies. That therefore, because the number of their preachers, and others of their sect, was as yet but very small, they were obliged to walk up and down secretly, as Christ and his Apostles did, because if the preachers should not walk cautiously and obscurely, they would be in danger of being persecuted and ill entreated by others."

It appears, that these processes were in the year 1494, which date is found at the beginning of these examinations.

"The foresaid process or examination was taken by me, notary, who have subscribed my name, GOBAUD."

This extract is faithfully transcribed out of a MS. in the public library of Cambridge, where it is to be seen in the original. But I thought fit to make it public at the end of this work, that the reader may compare those processes, in which the Inquisitors' faithfulness is justly to be suspected, since we see that there is very little of the first sumptum from the mouth of the Barba, in the process that was written afterwards by the notary of the Inquisitors, according to their pleasure, to expose them to the hatred of all the world.

CHAPTER 27

That the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont have constantly persevered in the same faith, until the time of the Reformation.

This is a confession which truth hath extorted from Claudius Seisselius. The most cruel persecutions have not been able to abolish the Churches of Italy, or to hinder them from a constant defense of that truth, which they received from their ancestors, as a sacred depositum. "All sorts of people," saith he, "have several times in vain endeavored to root them out, and yet, contrary to the opinion of all men, they have still continued conquerors, or at least wholly invincible."

It is easy to judge what the opinions of these Churches were before the Reformation, from what Seisselius himself tells us concerning them, before ever they heard of any reformation.

First, They lay it down as an infallible maxim, that the Pastors of the Romish Church had lost all the lawful authority which they could once have received from God. There were two causes, say they, of the election of Peter and the rest of the Apostles; the first was, because Christ knew their faith and their charity; the other, that by means of them he might reap much fruit from the rest of mankind: as also, that it might appear, that in this choice there was no respect of persons, but only regard had to their piety; and this to that degree, that in case they departed from it, they should not only fall from his grace and favor, but also be deprived of the authority he had conferred upon them. He saith elsewhere; I am the way, the truth, and the life; let him that serves me, follow me: and in another place, I am the vine, ye are the branches; he who abides in me, and I in him, brings forth much fruit: but he who abides not in me, shall be cut off, and cast into the fire. So long then as the Apostles continued in Christ, (now they always continued, from the time that they first received the Spirit,) the foundation of the universal Church has without doubt continued firm and unshaken, as resting upon most strong pillars and bases; and so likewise continued under their successors, as long as they imitated the actions, life, manners, and faith of the Apostles. But as soon as these successors began to wander and go astray from the precepts and doctrine of the Apostles, being seduced by divers lusts and sins, they no doubt departed also from Christ, and Christ from them, and consequently were cut off from his mystical body; for we cannot call them the Ministers of Christ, who are so far from following him, that they follow a quite contrary way. Whence it happens, that from a fruitful tree they are become the evil and unfruitful tree, which can bring forth no good fruit, except it be first made good itself; as our Savior himself witnesseth, saying, The evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit. So that the reason for which they were chosen ceasing, the effect of it must needs cease also. It is evident then that a wicked man, by his impiety, is cut off from the body of Christ, as a useless branch is cut off from the vine. Besides, he who is a child and slave of the Devil cannot have the same relation to Christ, seeing he-himself saith, No man can serve two masters; and elsewhere, Ye are of your father the Devil, because ye do his works. And besides, all those who offend God by enormous crimes, according to the testimony of the Prophet, are blotted out of the book of life, and consequently are rooted out from the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, the Church.

They maintain, that believers ought to separate themselves from the communion of the Church of Rome, because she has lost all her just authority, by the crimes of her Ministers, and her errors in matters of faith. Our Savior has warned us, say they, to beware of this sort of people; Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves: and that they might not be at a loss who those were they were to take heed of, he adds, You shall know them by their fruits. Now the fruits are our works; if they are evil, we be to be avoided, though we may be clothed like sheep.

When things are thus, how can that Bishop or Priest, who is the enemy of God, have the power of making God propitious to others? He who himself is banished from the kingdom of heaven, how can he have the keys of it? With what power can he confer orders? How can he administer the sacraments in the virtue of the Spirit, especially considering, that the Spirit is so far from dwelling in him, that he is an enemy of the Spirit? Surely the Spirit of God does not dwell in a body that is a slave to sin, but rather abominates both

his actions and prayers. And if God doth not hear the wicked, in vain do we implore the suffrages of him, who himself hath not God favorable to him. In a word, since neither his prayers nor his other actions are of any advantage, how can we suppose, that at his word Christ should transform himself under the species of bread and wine, and suffer himself to be handled by him whom he hath altogether rejected, and whose actions he detests and abhors? Moreover, O immortal God, what wise man can ever believe, that a king, endowed with the least grain of wisdom, will bestow his lieutenancy with sovereign power upon him to whom he scorns to allow a place amongst the meanest of his servants, him whom he thinks deserving the very worst of punishments? Who is the shepherd that trusts the wolf with his sheep? Shall a wise man trust his most chaste spouse with a filthy and dissolute libertine? Besides, is not he who turns himself away from God reduced to nothing? The Prophet saith, The wicked in his presence comes to nothing; also they shall be brought to nothing, like water that fleets away: and in many other places you will find the same. He therefore that is nothing, cannot be supposed to do any thing. And that we might not imagine that these things want Scripture testimonies to prove them, hear what God himself declares; To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I am sated with the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. And then adds, Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with. Your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye multiply your prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. And Malachi, speaking of these wicked Priests, cries out in this manner; I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I receive any offering at your hands. And a little lower, I will curse your blessings. After this he answers a tacit objection; for they might alleges that God had confirmed the priesthood to Levi by an eternal covenant, and therefore that he could not remove it from their family. But to this he plainly answers, that his covenant continued firm with the family of Levi, as long as they walked in the steps of their father Levi: for after he had said, My covenant of life and peace was with him; and I gave him my fear, and he feared me; he adds, But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have broken the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, etc. Which words are very applicable to all Bishops and Priests who transgress the ordinances of Christ and his Apostles; seeing he also speaks by another Prophet, I have hated the congregation of evil doers, and will not sit with the wicked. And elsewhere, I hate those that do wickedness, and all the workers of iniquity; and infinite such like passages. Is it not said of Saul, after that he had transgressed the commandment of the Lord, that the Spirit of God departed from him, though before he had been chosen by God himself to govern his people? Moreover, does not Christ say in the Gospel, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow me? and afterwards, No man can serve two masters, God and mammon? and that which is yet plainer and harder too, He who doth not forsake all that he hath, cannot be my disciple? Shall we imagine that he will commit his vicegerency to him whom he will not accept for his disciple? Now, if the Popes be such, who will part with nothing that belongs to them, and in other things do not keep the law of Christ, with what power then do they ordain Bishops? And those who receive any Orders from them, how can they confer the same upon others, since they are all of them sick of the same disease? In short, if they confer no Orders, then those whom they have ordained cannot be true Priests, and consequently neither can they administer any true sacrament; for if they really had Orders, yet they would defile them by the filthiness and impurity of their lives. If therefore we can make it appear, that such are all the Priests and Bishops of the Church of Rome, it will be evident, that the Church of God cannot consist of them; for Christ cannot be the head of them who are none of his members.

Some, it may be, will imagine that these accusations against the Church of Rome, and the corruption of her Pastors, are extremely exaggerated. But first, we have reason to commend the uprightness of Claudius Seisselius, in reference to these criminations, if we further consider what he saith of the Waldenses in opposition to the Church of Rome. "The Pope of Rome, and the rest of the Prelates and Priests of the Church of Rome, do neither follow the life nor the precepts of Christ, but do quite the contrary; and that no longer secretly, but so openly and manifestly, that it can no longer be hid or covered with a vail, because they chiefly value themselves in things that are contrary to religion, and do not only contemn, but mock at the precepts of the Apostles. They lived in great poverty, humility, chastity, continence, as to carnal things, and contempt of the world: whereas we Prelates and Priests live in great pomp, luxuriousness, and dissoluteness; we think it a brave thing to excel in royal power, rather than sacerdotal sanctity; and all our endeavors and studies drive only at the acquisition of glory amongst men, not by virtue, holiness, and learning, but by the abundance and plenty of all things, by arms and warlike magnificence, and by a vast

expense in an equipage, and furniture of horses, gold, and other things of that nature. The Apostles would not possess any thing as their own, nor would receive any into their society who had not forsaken all, and laid it in common: whereas we, not being contented with what we have already, fish for other people's goods, more avariciously and impudently than heathens themselves; therefore it is that we make wars, and incite Christian princes and people to take up arms. The Apostles travelling through towns and villages, and sowing the word of God with power, exercised besides many offices of charity, according to the several gifts they had received: whereas we do not only do nothing like this, and give no good examples of holy conversation, but besides, we frequently resist and oppose those that do, opening the way to all dissoluteness and avarice. They, as it were, against their wills, and with reluctancy, by the command or inspiration of God, received ordination to promote the salvation of others: whereas we buy benefices and preferments for money, or procure them by force, or by the favor of princes, and other indirect means, and for no other end but to satiate our lusts, to enrich our relations, and for the glory of the world. But besides all this, they spent their life in manifold fastings, watchings, and labors, being neither affrighted with trouble nor with danger, that they might shew to others the way to salvation: whereas we pass our time in idleness, in pleasures, and other earthly or wicked things. They despising gold and silver, as they had received the divine grace freely, so they dispensed it to others: whereas we set all holy things to sale, and barter with the heavenly treasures of God himself, and, in a word, confound all things, both divine and human. So that the Church of Rome cannot be said to be the spouse of Christ, but that common prostitute whom Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and St. John in the Revelation, describes in such lively colors; for Christ hath joined his Church to him to be his bride, holy, pure, fair, adorned with the ornaments and jewels of all virtues, without spot or wrinkle, such as the Holy Spirit figuratively describes her in the Canticles. Far be it therefore that Christ should ever think of changing this his beautiful and lovely bride, for such a stinking, loathsome harlot."

Secondly, We may say, that the case was so plain, that no disguise or excuse was any longer able to palliate the matter. "We do not deny," say the Waldenses, according to the account Seisselius gives us, "but that God alone is the searcher of hearts, who, as the Scripture saith, searcheth the heart and trieth the reins; and therefore that he alone knows whether the works of men be pleasing unto him, and obtain his favor, which others cannot know, save only by conjecture. But he himself hath taught us how we may know it, saying, You shall know them by their fruits; for an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit, nor a good tree evil fruit. Wherefore, though it be a difficult thing to judge of good works, because they receive their value from the intention of the doer, yet wicked works discover themselves, and the intention cannot make them good, especially when they are evidently repugnant to the law of God, and open and barefaced. And therefore, if I see the Bishops and Priests every day living in dissoluteness and luxury, robbing others of their goods, smiting their neighbors, persecuting those that are good, blaspheming the name of God, prodigally wasting the patrimony of the Church in voluptuousness and damnable crimes, may not I undoubtedly affirm, that they who commit these things are not the Ministers of God, but his public and avowed enemies? Surely such they are, though we should suppose created or confirmed by an universal synod of Christians, or by the Pope, or by Peter himself. But how much more may we conclude them such, when those who ordain them are worse than they themselves, and their works openly worse than theirs? What shall we say, if it appears that they have publicly and notoriously bought the papacy; that they openly set to sale sacerdotal functions; and that they set over the Churches, not by mistake, but out of malice, those who are known to be wholly unworthy of that charge; and who never in all their lifetime did any thing worthy either of a Priest, or so much as of a Christian? Shall we obey such Priests and Prelates, who lead us the way to salvation neither by word nor work, but rather endeavour all they can to drag us into the same pit of destruction after them? Doth not our Savior tell us, that we must not suffer ourselves to be led by blind guides, lest, when one blind man leads another, they both fall into the ditch? Hath not he declared, that such as these are cut off from the life of the Church and the body of Christ, and destined to the fire? How can he be the vicegerent of Christ, who is not so much as a Christian, or a member of the mystical body of Christ, whom he commands us to avoid as a heathen and publican, as long as he continues incorrigible. And the apostolical authority, the faith of Peter, which Christ saith should not fail the Catholic Church, with whom he promiseth to abide for ever, is to be found amongst us who imitate the life of the Apostles, who, according to our weakness, observe their commands and ordinances. We are those very persons of whom St. Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Corinthians;

Brethren, consider your calling, that you are not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble: but God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise; and the weak things of this world, to confound the things that are mighty; and the base and despised things of this

world, yea, the things that are not, to bring to nought the things that are. And St. Paul himself tells us, that he was sent to preach the Gospel, not in the mightiness of man's wisdom, but in simplicity and plainness; alleging to this purpose what the Lord saith elsewhere; I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nought the prudence of the prudent."

Without doubt the Bishop of Meaux will tell us, that all this is nothing else but the overflowing of a schismatical temper, exasperated by the corruption of the Clergy and their licentiousness; but that indeed there is nothing in all this that shews them to have held the same principles with those of the Reformation. I shall then make it my business to evidence the contrary, and that after so clear and visible a manner, that the Bishop shall no longer be in a condition to disguise it. What Seisselius tells us in particular, concerning the articles of their faith, is this:

"They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testament."

"They say, that the Popes of Rome, and other Priests, have depraved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses."

"They say, that they owe neither tithes nor firstfruits to the Clergy."

"They say, that the consecrations of churches, indulgences, and other such like benedictions, are the inventions of false Priests."

"They do not celebrate the festivals of the saints."

"They say, that men do not stand in need of the suffrages of the saints: Christ abundantly sufficing in all things."

"They affirm, that marriage may be contracted in any degree, excepting only one or two at the most; as if the Popes had no power to prohibit marriage in any other degrees."

"They say, that whatever is done to deliver the souls of the dead from the pains of purgatory, is useless, lost, and superstitious." "They say, that our Priests have no power of forgiving sins."

"They say, that they alone observe the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, and upon this account, by an intolerable impudence, they usurp the name of the Catholic Church."

Their Barbae, saith Seisselius, do err greatly, because they are neither sent of God, nor by the Pastors of the Church, but of the Devil; as appears from their damnable doctrine.

"They say, that the authority of hearing confessions belongs to all Christians that walk according to the Apostles' precepts, (which their Barbae attribute to themselves,) because St. James saith, Confess your sins one to another."

"They say, that we ought not to admit any kind of prayer, except it appear that it was composed by some certain author, and approved of God, in order to obtain something of him. Their Barbae have often preached this doctrine, to abolish the service of the glorious Virgin, and of other saints."

"They do not think that Christians ought to say the angelical salutation to the mother of God, alleging, that it has not the form of a prayer, but a salutation: but it is only that they might rob the Virgin of this service, saying, that it is not lawful to worship or serve her any more than the rest of the saints."

"They affirm, that the blessings of the Priests are of no virtue at all. Did not Christ bless the bread in the desert? When the Apostles sat down to eat bread, they blessed what was set upon the table."

"They say, there is no need of holy water in the churches, because neither Christ himself nor his Apostles either made it or commanded it: as if we ought to say or do nothing but what we read was done by them."

"They say, that the indulgences allowed of by the Church are despicable useless things."

"They say, that the souls of the dead, without being tried by any purgation, do immediately upon their parting from the body enter into joy or pains, and that the Clergy, blinded by their covetousness, have invented purgatory."

"They say, that the saints cannot take notice of what is done here below."

"They abhor and detest all images, and the sign of the cross, much more than we honor them."

"They make no distinction between the worship of latria, which is due to God only, and that of dulia, which belongs to the saints."

"As to the fasts, which the Catholic Church has instituted for the honor of God and the saints, they have yet less reason to object these to us."

There is a pleasant error Seisselius ascribes to them, about the nature of lying, which evidenceth how great their purity was as to this article, and with what impudence it is that their enemies calumniate them with equivocation. "They affirm, that a lie is always a mortal sin, because David says, God destroys all liars." But it is evident that these general propositions are to be moderated, otherwise who should be saved? Hereupon to convince them in an error, he accuseth all the saints, even St. Paul and Christ himself, to have made use of lies upon occasion. But because in all this we have made no mention of transubstantiation, the Bishop of Meaux will take it for granted, that in Seisselius's time the Waldenses received it as a doctrine of faith; but he will mistake himself if he do, for Seisselius declares, that they rejected it as a great extravagance. He tells us also,

"That they made a mock of all the artifices they made use of, to make it appear more plausible to them. I think, saith he, that those took pains to little purpose, who, writing against this sect, made it their chief business to insist upon the difficulties about the sacrament of the Eucharist, and, in order to the clearing of them, have spoken so sharply and subtilly, that I may not say confusedly, that I have great reason to doubt whether ever they understood the thing themselves. Yet I will not say, that because I do not comprehend it myself, (for that I ingenuously confess,) I think it also to surpass the capacity of others; but because it has always appeared to me to be a point of that difficulty, that the most able have been fain to profess, that the strength of human understanding must in this case be subject to faith." After which he useth his utmost endeavors to persuade the Waldenses to embrace an opinion, for the which they had always testified a great aversion.

By this we may see what was the faith of the believers of Piedmont, as far as Seisselius's account thereof reacheth. And as for their carriage and conversation, the same Seisselius tells us;

"They say, that they desire only to overcome by the simplicity of faith, purity of conscience, and integrity of life; not by philosophical niceties and theological subtilties."

"Setting aside what they hold in opposition to our faith and religion, for the rest, saith that Bishop, they for the most part lead a more pure life than other Christians. They swear not

at all, except they be forced to it, and very rarely take the name of God in vain: they honestly perform their promises; and the most part of them living in poverty, they protest that they alone observe the life and doctrine of the Apostles, and therefore affirm, that the power of the Church resides in them, as the true innocent disciples of Jesus Christ, for the sake of whose faith and religion they live in poverty."

It is impossible to give them a more advantageous testimony than what he gives them elsewhere, acknowledging, that they looked upon it as an honorable and glorious thing to suffer the persecutions which were raised against them by the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER 28

Containing the conclusion of this Treatise.

These are the observations I thought myself obliged to make upon the ecclesiastical history of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, to evidence their apostolical succession. If in this undertaking I have not been able to clear some points, the fault thereof is to be charged on those who have persecuted them to the highest degree of outrage and cruelty, and who have spared none of their monuments of antiquity, but such as they thought might some way or other make these believers odious and abominable to those of the Romish communion. However, I hope that an equal reader will meet with some satisfaction from these my endeavors, and will easily conclude from these remarks, that the cause of that implacable hatred of the Pope and his Clergy, against the Churches of Piedmont, was nothing else but the design of extirpating a race of people, whose zeal for the purity of the Gospel engaged them to upbraid the Church of Rome with her corruptions in matters of faith, her idolatry, her false and superstitious worship, and her horrid tyranny.

And forasmuch as my design is not to abuse my reader, I neither pretend to excuse all the errors which some of the members of these Churches may have held, nor indeed to justify them altogether, in all the articles which might have been objected against them, during the time of almost six hundred years, wherein the Romish party has opposed them. I am persuaded, that all good men will have that equity and kindness for these Churches, which the Doctors of the Romish Church do so dexterously make use of themselves, upon occasion of any indictments formed against the primitive Church, in those times that were nearest to the Apostles, by those that have attacked them; or when the question is concerning errors found in the writings of the most ancient Doctors or Fathers of the Church. Should any do otherwise, they would declare themselves thereby to be in opposition to natural equity and the principles of charity, especially since after all it cannot be denied, but that the body of these Churches have always preserved amongst them whatsoever is necessary to the constitution of a true society of Christians.

The Church of Rome herself furnisheth us with an excuse for some of the errors they had in common with the Christians of old, when she owns, that for all them they did not cease to be true Churches. Some of these errors are such, as that they of the Church of Rome are ready to apologize for these Churches in that behalf; and there be others again, wherein though they have not the approbation of many Protestant Churches, yet can they defend themselves with their agreeing therein with other Christian communions, whom the Protestants own for true members of the Church of Jesus Christ.

I cannot but represent to the reader the particular character which the author of the Noble Lesson has given us of these Churches, viz. their constancy in suffering the persecution of the Church of Rome, and indeed this is their true character in a most eminent and illustrious degree; for scarcely is there a Church to be found in the world, that ever had the advantage of having borne the cross of Christ, as the Church of the Valleys of Piedmont have done. Never did the Church of Rome give in a more incontestable evidence of her own antichristianism, than by her insatiable thirst after the blood of those Christians, who renounced her communion these six hundred years last past, for to allay which, she has made the blood of these poor innocents to run down every where like rivers, exterminating by fire and sword those who were not moved by the empty noise of her anathemas: so that for so great an interval of time the Waldenses have always been in the condition of sheep led to the slaughter, by their continual and uninterrupted martyrdom maintaining and adorning the religion of our Savior, which the Church of Rome did no longer profess, but in mode and way adapted to her corrupt worldly interests, and to the design she had of making it a stalking horse to the pomp, lordliness, and tyranny of her Pope and Clergy.

Whatsoever reflections they of the Church of Rome may pass upon God's seeming to have abandoned these poor and helpless Churches to the rage and fury of their cannibal party, I am fully persuaded, that they who have never so little made it their study to consider the conduct of Providence towards the primitive Church,

will not at all be offended at this seeming desertion of the Waldenses, and abandoning of them to the outrageous cruelty of their persecutors, nor look upon the seeming triumphs of the apostate Church as a mark of the weakness of the truth professed by these people. And indeed, notwithstanding the extreme rigour of their persecutions, we find, that God hath tenderly preserved them until the Reformation; and though he has often exposed them to the rage and barbarous usage of their persecutors, yet withal has from time to time sent them such deliverances, which have continued them until this day: these their persecutions, like those of the Apostles, having only served to procure martyrs to the glorious truth of the Gospel, and to disperse throughout all places the knowledge and good savor thereof, which the Romish party, treading in the steps of the ancient synagogue, did so cruelly persecute.

Without doubt this was the reflection Luther made upon this account, when he was so far from being offended at the rumor his adversaries had spread concerning him, that by means of the close pursuit of Leo X. he had no place left to hide his head, save amongst the Picars, who were a colony of the Waldenses, settled in Bohemia, he openly declared, that he was not in the least troubled at this their report; for after he had more exactly informed himself of their belief, and having searched into the design and intent of those black calumnies charged upon them, he owned them for his brethren, and commended them for faithful Christians: and though at that time he did not agree with them in all things, as being not himself wholly freed from the impurities of the Church of Rome, yet he writes to them with such an affection and esteem, as abundantly shews the respect he had for those who for so long a time had opposed the corruptions of the truth.

It was upon the same account that Conrad Pellican, one of the most learned men that had a hand in the Reformation, undertook in the year 1543, at Zurich, publicly to read the works of the Waldenses, that is to say, those pieces which since have been published by the author of *Fasciculus verum expetendarum*, and by Lydius, which contain their apologies presented to King Vadislas. By this means he gave to his auditors an occasion and sure means to refute the ridiculous cavillings of the Papists, who were very desirous, as they are still, to fix the epocha of the Reformation to the year 1517, in pointing out to them a whole body of a Church, which, in spite of all the opposition of the Romish party, had always maintained the truth, and preserved it in a sufficient degree of purity, whilst the Church of Rome made use of her utmost endeavors to corrupt it, to serve her own base designs.

The learned and famous Usher followed the steps of these great men, in his undertaking to justify the Waldenses, and to make out their succession, with so many marks of exactness and diligence, and in having prompted those that have conversed with him, and who have inherited of his light and spirit, earnestly to desire that the history of these Churches might be more and more cleared.

Let the Bishop of Meaux then, if he please, think the Protestants might be ashamed to go and look for their ancestors among the Waldenses, and to hunt for them in the caverns of the Alps. His declamations shall never be able to make us forego a jot of that tender veneration and respect we have most justly conceived for this nursery and seed-plot of martyrs, and for those triumphant troops, who have so generously lavished away their blood in the defence of truth, against all the efforts, all the machinations, and all the violences of the Romish party. The judgment of St. Hilarius, expressed in his writing against Auxentius, may be sufficient to arm us against all the cavils of those who will needs have, that it was impossible that ever their Church should lose its purity, or that the same should be preserved by these Churches, reduced to caverns and mountains. *Unum moneo, cavete Antichristum. Male enim vos parietum amor coepit, male ecclesiam Dei in tectis aedificiisque veneramini; male sub his pacem ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est in his antichristum sessurum? Montes mihi et sylvae et lacus et carceres et voragines sunt tutiores; in his enim Prophetæ aut manentes, aut demersi Dei spiritu prophetabant*, p. 316. Oper. Hilarii. "One thing I must warn you of, beware of Antichrist. It is ill done of you to fall in love with walls; it is ill done of you to reverence the church of God in buildings and edifices; you do ill to rest in these things. Or, can you question, that it is on these Antichrist will fix his throne? Give me mountains, forests, pits, and prisons, as being far the safer places; for in these it was that the Prophets prophesied from the spirit of GOD."

Scriptum Inquisitoris cujuspiam anonymi de Valdensibus, ex codice MS. G. in publica Bibliotheca Cantabrig.

UT vobis Reverendissimo in Christo Patri et Domino, Domino Rostagno Ebredunensi Archiepiscopo, vobisque Reverendis Patribus et Dominis Fratri Laurentio Cistaricensi Episcopo, et Thomae Paschalis Orlanensi Officiali, Commissariis Apostolicis, Regia et Dalphinali auctoritate suffultis ad causam eorum pauperum de Lugduno, quos vulgus Valdenses appellat, dictos a Valdeo, cive Lugdunensi, in loco dicto vulgariter Val grant moram faciente, qui homo dives hacresiarcha primus hacresis sectae Valdensium inventor fuit, secundum Scripturam, Qui bonis temporalibus renunciatis, coepit cum suis complicibus vitam apostolicam cum cruce et paupertate ducere. Et expectatis viris ecclesiasticis, multos sibi discipulos sociavit, qui inde dicti sunt Pauperes de Lugduno, qui dicentes vivere sub obedientia apostolica, ab illa tamen se separantes pertinaciter respondebant cum redarguerentur, Magis esse Deo obediendum quam hominibus: fuerunt tandem et merito per militantem Ecclesiam damnati, sed non radicitus extirpati, quia Lugduno fugientes ad ultimas Dalphinatus partes, se transferentes in Ebredunensi et Taurinensi dioecesibus in Alpibus et intra concava montium accessu difficilia, plures ibi ex ipsis habitaverunt, ubi paulatim procurante satore zizaniarum, in copioso numero excreverunt, et demum palmites suos tristes in Liguriam, Italiam, et ultra Romam in Apuliam transmiserunt: et quemadmodum Christus Redemptor noster discipulos suos binos mittebat ad praedicandum; sic et idiota et bestialis illius sectae magniscius alios magistros inferiores per ipsum creatos et probatos, quos vulgo Barbas dicimus, ad docendum et praedicandum huiusmodi sectae doctrinam, hinc inde binos mittere solitus fuit, hi siquidem Barbae creari solent per eorum supremum in civitate Aquilae in regno Neapolitano; et in eorum creatione quaedam solet fieri solennitas. Nam in derisum Romani Pontificis, eis nomina mutantur cum ad magisterium huiusmodi afficiuntur, cujus siquidem damnatissimae hacresis cultores, quibus viri et mulieres vallis Clusionis Taurinensis dioecesis, et omnes mares et foeminae vallis Fraxinariae, ac plures vallium Argenteriae et Loysiae Ebredunensis dioecesis a tanto tempore quod non est memoria hominum, in contrarium fuerunt prae plusquam centum numero ex ipsis sponte confessi fuerunt, sequentes articulos contra fidem nostram, tenuerunt, tenentque, et immobiliter observant. Et ut de eo constet et liquidius appareat, Procurator fidelis juncto Procuratore patriae et locorum circumvicinorum patriae Briantonensis et Ebredunensis pro manutentione fidei Christianae et honoris patriae relevatione contra omnes et singulos dictae vallis Fraxinariae, dat et facit sequentes titulos, quos petit admitti ad probandum, citra tamen onus superfluae probationis, ad quod se astringere non intendit, de quo et de expensis contra eos omnes et singulos solenniter protestatur.

In primis ponit et dicit, ac probare intendit, quod ipsi homines vallis Fraxinariae fuerunt a centum annis citra ultra, ac per tempora ipsa et alia a tanto tempore cujus initii memoria hominum non existit, fuerunt et de praesenti sunt haeretici, et sequentes articulos contra Catholicam fidem tenuerint et tenent; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod fuerunt et de praesenti sunt pro haeticis et Valdensibus habiti, tenti et reputati communiter, et ab omnibus de eisdem et eorum vita, moribus, et conversatione notitiam habentibus; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod de praemissis fuit et est publica vox et fama, nedum apud circumvicinos, imo et apud omnes a centum leucis et ultra distantes a dicta valle; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod fuerunt et de praesenti sunt ubique terrarum de hacresi et damnatissima Valdensium sectae fidei Christianae contraria diffamati; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, et manifestum.

Item et quod propterea homines locorum circumvicinorum, licet Catholici et Christiani, ac Christi fideles, ex ipsorum de Fraxinaria labe ubique terrarum dehonestantur, et impropriae quamplurima..... atque damna et interesse, quia ab honoribus multis commodis rejiciuntur ex suspitione ipsorum de Fraxinaria; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod dicti de Fraxinaria haeretici dicuntur, et visi sunt mali et obstinati, et fidei Catholicae contrarii, iniqui ac perversi, ac pro talibus habiti, tenti, et reputati, articulos sequentes contra fidem Christi tenentes; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et pro eo, quia Ecclesiam Romanam dicunt Ecclesiam malignantium, et eam diffamant et reprobant, et ita credunt damnabiliter et contra fidem Catholicam; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et pro eo, quia credunt et crediderunt quod in ipsis tantum sit Ecclesia Dei, qui vivunt in paupertate, in eorum symbolo credentes in sanctam Ecclesiam sine macula et ruga constitutam; et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia damnabiliter credunt et crediderunt quod eorum Magistri et Barbac potestatem habeant ligandi et solvendi, et quod illis et non Presbyteris Romanac Ecclesiae confitenda sunt peccata; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod non licuit nec licet Praelatos Romanac Ecclesiae habere patrimonium aut jurisdictionem temporalem in hoc seculo, et quod a beato Sylvestro non fuit verus Papa; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod quantam quis habet sanctitatem, tantam habet facultatem et potestatem in Ecclesia, et non ultra; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod sacramenta per Presbyteros Romanac Ecclesiae ministrata nullius sint efficaciac seu virtutis; contra fidem nostram, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod eisdem Presbyteris Romanac Ecclesiae non sunt solvendae decimae, neque eis sunt dandae oblationes, propter praemissa; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod de censuris et poenis per Praelatos Romanac Ecclesiae inflictis curandum non est, quoniam non arctant neque ligant propter defectum sanctitatis, quia non servant vestigia Christi; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod Romana Ecclesia est Domus confusionis, Babylon, Meretrix, et Synagoga Diaboli; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod eidem Romanac Ecclesiae, seu Praelatis eisdem, non est obediendum; et quod omnes eis obedientes sunt damnati; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod nullum est purgatorium in alio seculo, sed tantum purgantur viventes in praesenti, et quod dum quis moritur, statim avolat ad paradisum, vel labitur in infernum, asseverantes Ecclesiam Romanam cupiditate ductam purgatorium invenisse; et quod pro mortuis ideo non est orandum; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod pro quacunque re vera vel falsa non licet jurare; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod licitum est libidinose convenire, et participare etiam cum omni persona sibi in quovis consanguinitatis vel affinitatis gradu conjuncta, saltem quando conveniunt cum aliis ejusdem sectae in eorum praedicationibus, et extinctis luminibus; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod tantum prodest Deum orare in stabulo, quantum in Ecclesia; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod solus Deus orandus est, non autem Virgo Maria, non sancti et sanctae, quia cum sint a nobis remoti, non possunt audire preces nostras; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod aquae pluviales sunt ejusdem virtutis, sicut sunt aquae benedictae in ecclesia, quia omnes aquae fuerunt a Deo benedictae; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod etiam Dominis temporalibus non est obediendum, nisi sint de eorum secta; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item quod pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod detegere aliquem de dicta secta est peccatum irremissibile, contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod extra eorum sectam nemo salvatur, et qui sunt de eorum secta sancti esse dicuntur; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod de festivitibus sanctorum et sanctarum per Romanam Ecclesiam introductis, non est curandum, quod licitum est omni die opus servile exercere; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt quod ubicunque licet et permissum est vesci camibus, et quocunque tempore anni, et quod jejunia per Ecclesiam Romanam introducta non sunt servanda, eorum quadragesimam incipiendo secunda feria post primam Dominicam Quadragesimae; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod non licet haereticis eorum sectae cum Catholicis matrimonia contrahere, et multa alia erronea et nefaria tenuerunt, crediderunt, et praedicaverunt, prout confessi fuerunt, et contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea Reverendissimi dudum Pontifices et Praelati Ebredunenses, cum Inquisitoribus haereticarum pravitate retroactis temporibus, magnos assumpserunt labores, ut haereticam ipsam sectam a partibus illis avellerent, usque ad tempora Reverendissimi in Christo Patris et Domini Domini Joannis Archiepiscopi Ebredunensis novissime vita functi, et hoc est verum.

Item et quod praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Ebredunensis Archiepiscopus statim post ejus assumptionem, et de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo sexagesimo primo, ne sanguis eorum de suis manibus exquireretur, ad corrigendos illorum excessus, et ad extirpandam illam haereticam sectam per monitiones, exhortationes, et commendationes, coepit diligenter insurgere, sed intervenientibus impedimentis, non potuit ad finem perducere; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea, de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo septuagesimo tertio Frater Joannes Veylleti, ordinis Minorum, sacrae Theologiae Doctor, et Inquisitor auctoritate apostolica deputatus contra ipsos de Vallibus Frayxineriac, Argenteriac, et Vallis Loysiac, processus formavit, ex quibus detecta est dicta haeretica secta, qua pro insertis articulis sponte confessi sunt credidisse; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo

octuagesimo tertio, cum viris Catholicis et aliis eorum complicitibus usque ad numerum nonaginta novas informationes sumpsit, ex quibus apparet quod omnes illi de Frayxineria, et multi de Valle Loysia et Argenteria diffamatissimi et suspectissimi de dicta haeretica secta apud omnes habebantur; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea praefatus Reverendissimus quondam Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus, et de anno millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo sexto et diebus decima octava et vigesima nona Junii, et tertio die nona Julii ejusdem anni eos genemliter moneri fecit infra terminum in litteris contentum et per litteras patentes debite executas, quibus parere neglexerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea et successive, et de mense Augusti, praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus mandavit eos omnes nominatim suspectos citari responsuros de fide, offerendo illis gratiam, si redire vellent ad gremium Ecclesiae, qui contumaciter comparere neglexerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive de anno praedicto et die decima quinta Septembris praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus litteras patentes laxavit et excommunicatorias in eorum perfidiam et obstinatam contumaciam executas die decima septima ejusdem Septembris, et quam excommunicationem sustinuerunt usque ad diem sextam mensis Februarii anni Domini millesimi

quadringentesimi octuagesimi septimi, et a longe ultra in excommunicatione sorduerunt. Inter quos nominatus fuit Angellinus Palloni, qui tanto opere nunc ad veritatem occultandam suis mendaciis elaborat; et hoc est verum.

Item et successive Reverendissimus Pater Dominus Albertus de Cappitaneis, Archidiaconus Cremonensis, in utraque facultate non mediocriter peritus, autoritate apostolica deputatus, contra eosdem processit, et informationes sumpsit, et de anno millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo octavo et die sexta Februarii, et se informavit cum quatuor ex complicibus eorum concludentibus in effectum cum aliis per praefatum Reverendissimum quondam Dominum Joannem Archiepiscopum super his examinatis, ex quo formatis processibus, certis motus respectibus, a sede apostolica obtinuit procedere non vocato Ordinario, et tandem nominatim citari mandavit eosdem responsuros de fide, eisdem benigne oblata gratia, si redire vellent ad Ecclesiae unitatem. Quibus citationibus ipsi obstinati haeretici comparere contempserunt; ex quo undecima Februarii successive pro secunda vice citati per litem debite executas, iterum contumaciter comparere neglexerunt. Et ideo contra eosdem et merito litem excommunicatorias laxavit debite executas et publicatas, sed excommunicationem ipsam et aggravationem semper magis eorum perfidia sustinuerunt, ex quo per litem patentes citati fuerunt visuri loca ad quae ipsis declinare contingebat supponi ecclesiastico interdicto, qui pariter comparere postposuerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive praefatus Dominus commissarius sapius misit ad eos plures viros Deum timentes et salutem animarum haereticorum illorum quacrentes, ut eos ad viam lucis et gratiae reducerent, sed illos tanquam obstinatos ad postulandum veniam nullo modo flectere potuerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive ac propterea antefactus Dominus Commissarius eos nominatim citari mandavit, ut coram eo comparerent audituri definitivam sententiam per ipsum ferendam per litem debite executas die secunda Martii anno supradicto, qui contumaciter semper magis comparere neglexerunt; et ideo nemine comparente, praefatus Dominus Commissarius cemens cor eorum induratum esse, nec in eis signa aliqua poenitentiae apparere, cum peritorum consilio, visis omnibus praecedentibus, ad suam definitivam processit sententiam, per quam eos ut haeticos pertinaces et rebelles brachio seculari reliquit; et hoc est verum.

Item quod propterea ex commissione extremi Parlamenti Dalphinalis pro brachio seculari implorati, strenuus miles Dominus Hugo de Palude Comes de Varax, Locumtenens Dalphini, et magnificus Jurium Doctor, et Dalphini Consiliarius Dominus Joannes Rabboti, servatis de jure servandis, processerunt contra eosdem qui proprias relinquentes domos, cavemas et latibula montium, ac rupturas rupum sibi pro fortalicio elegerunt: sed interim dicti Domini Commissarii Apostolicus et Dalphinales iterum eis gratiam et Ecclesiae gremium obtulerunt; proviso quod puro corde et fide non ficta redirent. Ipsi vero tunc quasi omnes de rupibus sponte non ligati, non quacstionati descendentes qui voluerunt venire mares et foeminac ad gratiam benigne recepti fuerunt per eundem Commissarium Apostolicum, et confessi fuerunt gratis et sine metu torturac, se fuisse et esse Valdenses, seu Pauperes de Lugduno, et illorum hacresim seu sectam tenuisse, ac illi et illius articulis supra descriptis credidisse, et inter ceteros Angellinus Palloni qui materiam prosequitur ad pracsens, ac testante processu pracsenti justificando in forma probante; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod reliqui, duodecim vel quindecim numero, in eorum turma existentes, qui contenti gratia et venia, diabolico spiritu imbuti ab aliis aufugemnt cum essent plus obstinati, baniti fuerunt; et hoc est verum, notorium, et manifestum.

Item et quod alii ad gratiam admissi de se sponte confessi, dictam damnatissimam Valdensium sectam et haeticam pravitatem supra declaratam abjuraverunt et quamcunque aliam solenniter post praedicationem, et in eorum abjurationibus expresse promiserunt inter alia nusquam receptare seu occultare praedictos banitos, sed illos dum venirent repellere, et Ecclesiae intimare, atque eis injungendas sententias satisfactorias pro peccatis efficaciter adimplere constante processu; et hoc est verum, et sub poena relapsus in processu contenta.

Item et quod pro poenitentiis fuit eis specialiter injunctum post abjurationem supradictam, quod viri qui fuemnt in cavemis rupum se defendentes, ad quinquenium, alii vero qui non ibi fuemnt, ad biennium deferrent cruces duas telac crocei coloris in superiori veste ante et retro consutas, et talia fuemnt eis injuncta Ebreduni, ubi fuemnt ante fores majoris Ecclesiae; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive dicti abjurati post eorum abjurationem Ecelesiac mandatis et monitionibus, abjurationibus et monitionibus et promissionibus factis parere pertinaciter contempserunt; et ideo nominatim citati fuerunt visuri testes praedicti jurare et examinari contra eos per procuratorem fidei producendos, quibus non comparentibus ac testibus in eorum contumacia examinatis, iterum citati fuerunt visuri attestations publicari, qui comparere renuerunt; ex quorum quidem testium tam Presbyterorum quam aliorum Catholicorum bonorum fide dignorum, et suorum complicum depositionibus luce meridiana clarioribus apparet eosdem de Frayxineria fuisse et esse fictos conversos et relapsos, quia haereticos banitos receptaverunt, et poenitentias eis injunctas non impleverunt, vocati venire noluerunt, quinimo Barbas et Magistros Valdensium postmodo receperunt, et eis more pristino confessi sunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive autoritate apostolica deputatus fuit Inquisitor in dictis vallibus frater Franciscus Plorerii ordinis Minorum, sacrae Theologiae professor, qui de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono, et die prima Januarii, intelligens quod ipsi de Frayxineria de relapsu essent diffamati signanter informatus a curato loci, et a pluribus de dicto loco Frayxineriac, ac cum veris Catholicis et etiam complicibus usque ad numerum sexaginta sex, quorum dictorum apparuit quod dicti de Frayxineria non impleverunt eis impositas poenitentias, nec detulerunt cruces in suis superioribus vestibus: quinimo receptaverunt haereticos banitos, nec revelarunt Ecclesiae, contravenientes eorum abjurationibus, inter quos Angelinus Paloni, qui nunc causam prosequitur, descriptus invenitur, ex quo viso informabatur antefactus dominus Inquisitor cum Ordinario procedens, quia solus non poterat, per litem patentes eos omnes nominatim citari mandavit responsuros de fide et de relapsu, qui suspectissimi se excusaturos, executos de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono et die vigesima quarta Maii: qui tamen comparere postposuerunt, ex quo per alias litem legitime executas secundo citati fuerunt eodem anno, et die vigesima octava Maii, sed comparere contempserunt, duobus exceptis, qui nominibus propriis comparuerunt, et ideo non comparentes fuerunt. Et tertio per litem die septima Junii ejusdem anni debite executas vocati et non comparentes, in eorum contumacia excommunicati, et crescente contumacia aggravati, et quam excommunicationis sententiam in eos, ut praemittitur, latam, indurato animo sustinuerunt et adhuc sustinent, propter quod per alias vestras legitime executas anno praedicto et die vigesima octava Junii citati fuerunt audituri, et visuri se veluti pertinaces haereticos relapsos brachio seculari relinquere, et eorum bona a die commissi quacvis confiscata fuisse declarari; qui et iterum citati anno praedicto et die quinta Julii, ac iterum vocati anno quo supra et die sexta Septembris audituri sententiam contra eos ferendam, nunquam ut obstinati comparere curaverunt, ex quo recte et rite jure suadente damnati fuerunt, ex quo nunc audiendi non sunt, cum sint excommunicati, et interdicti, et pro talibus ac haereticis pertinacibus declarati per sententias in rem judicatam transactas, nulla appellatione suspensas, adversus quas dicere aliquid admitti posse non videtur, nisi prius parito monitionibus, et judicatis, et Ecclesiae mandatis ac solutis expensis, super quibus dictus Procurator, tanquam super articulo praepjudiciabili, petit jus dici et interloqui, jusque et justitiam ministrari, officium vestrum humiliter implorando.

Processus Inquisitoris contra Barbam Martinum, ex Cod. MS. H. in Biblioth. publica Cantabr.

ANNO Domini millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimo secundo, die septima mensis Augusti, apud Ulcium venemibilis Dominus Bartholomaeus Paschalis Canonicus, et Pidancerius ac Locumtenens venemendi Domini de Turrellis, Vicarii Genemlis reverendissimi in Christo Patris et Domini, Domini Joannis Michaelis miseratione divina Episcopi Praenestini, Cardinalis sancti Angeli, Administratoris et Commendatoris incliti monasterii Ulciensis, secum existentibus spectabilibus et egregiis Dominis Pontio Pontii Dalphinali Consiliario, et Oroncio Eme Judice Bemensi, processit ad examinationem Francisci de Girundino, de Spoletio Barba Martino nuncupato, detento infra carceres Dalphinales Ulcii.

Et primo dixit, quod sunt sexdecim anni elapsi quod Girondinus ejus pater ipsum loquentem ipsam fidem Valdensium et haeresim docuit. Et incoepit ipsum ducere per patrias.

Interrogatus per quas patrias et regiones eum eduxit? dixit quod per patrias et regiones Italiac, videlicet Januac, Bononiac, Luce, et per montem Marchancone, et ipse ejus pater, qui erat Barba, ibat ad confitendum et praedicandum gentes in illis montibus.

Interrogatus cum quibus fuit, in quibus partibus, et quos persequebatur et conversatus est? dixit quod ex post secundo anno ivit ad discendum dictam doctrinam Valdensium cum viro alio Barba vocato Bamovo,

qui emt de loco Perupage, et de dominio de Camerino, qui duxit ipsum spacio duorum vel trium annorum per loca supradicta.

Interrogatus cum quo ex post dictum Bamovo sequutus est dictam doctrinam, dixit quod cum quodam alio Barba nominato Josue, qui emt de loco sancto de dominio de Camerino, prope locum de Camerino, trium milliatium de Charretto. Dicens ulterius quod postquam ivit cum dicto Josue ad confitendum et pradicandum dictam sectam, et per dicta loca quidam alius Barba, nominatus Andreas, duxit ipsum ad eorum magnum magistrum qui vocatur Joannes Antonii, et qui suam residentiam facit in loco de Cambro de dominio Papac.

Interrogatus quid sibi dixit dictus magnus magister, dixit quod in primis injunxit sibi quod faceret sacramentum sub fide ipsorum, et aliud insuper sibi injunxit. Super omnibus quod pro aliqua re mundi non revelaret, prorsus nec manifestaret quae sibi dicere volebat.

Dicens sibi quod manifestare seu revelare eorum fidem emt peccatum inexpiabile et irremissibile. Dicens eidem, quod si vellet sectam tenere, et insequi dictam sectam, faceret sibi multa bona.

Interrogatus si erant aliqui alii, dixit quod sic, quos vocabat Barbas, et vocabatur ipse magnus magister eorum Barba, et dicebat quod omnes tenebant dictam fidem, et quod tenerent secrete.

Et ulterius dicebat, magnus magister qui monebat eos, ut servarent eorum fidem et essent salvati, et ita pradicabat, Quod omnes qui sequerentur eorum fidem erunt salvati; qui vero non sequerentur eandem sectam, non erunt salvati, sed erunt damnati.

Interrogatus quod est potissimum fundamentum eorum fidei et sectae? dixit quod eorum magister dixit, et ita reperiunt dicti Barbac eundo per mundum, quod propter malam et pessimam vitam Papac, Cardinalium, Episcoporum, et Sacerdotum, Religiosorum, et omnium aliorum ecclesiasticorum virorum, ipsi Barbac sequuntur hanc fidem, et reperiunt infinitos errores. Quia dicti Papa, Cardinales, Episcopi, et ecclesiastici viri, ducunt, et omnes sequuntur avaritiam, luxuriam, ac superbiam et pompas, peccatum gulac et irac; et in hoc omnes viri ecclesiastici errant; et eorum hoc est potissimum fundamentum, quia viri ecclesiastici male et pessime vivunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod postquam ipsi viri ecclesiastici sunt in peccato mortali, non possunt ministrare sacramenta, nec valent ea quae ipsi faciunt, quia quando efficiuntur sacerdotes, jurant castitatem, puritatem, et virginitatem, et quando eorumittunt peccata, frangunt fidem et juramentum, et veniunt contra fidem, et ex post perdunt omnimodam potestatem, quia quando eandela lucens mortua est, non potest aliam vivificare.

Dicens ulterius, quod non est Papa, nec Cardinalis, nec Episcopus, nec aliquis alius ecclesiasticus vir, qui ut plurimum non habeat suam dominam et suum regasum, qui dormiunt cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod dictus ejus magnus magister eisdem injunxit quod pradicarent et ampliarent eam fidem, et traherent gentes quantum possint ad illam, quia hoc faciendo lucrarentur vitam actemam, cum omnes de eorum fide sunt salvati, cacteri vero damnati, Dicens, quod quando eorum magnus magister.... appellat communitatem; quando facit eos Barbas, et dat potestatem, mutat eorum nomina, et quod ipse, antequam esset Barba effectus per dictam eorum communitatem, appellabatur Franciscus, et quando fuit factus Barba, imposuit sibi nomen Martinus.

Dicens ulterius, quod econstituuntur Barbac, et vacat officium Barbarum, et quando moritur aliquis Barba, substituitur unus alius loco illius. Interrogatus si habeant provincias, dixit quod non, sed vadunt per mundum circumcirca.

Interrogatus quid ulterius injungebat eorum magister, et quid pradicare consueverunt Barbac per orbem, dixit quod dicebat, et ipsi pradicare consueverunt, quod unus solus Deus est adorandus, qui creavit coelum et terram, lunam, solem, et stellas, et aquam, et quod credant solum et dumtaxat ea quae vident.

Interrogatus quid dicebat eorum magister eisdem Barbis de sanctis, et quid praedicant de sanctis, dixit quod credunt in S. Petrum, et post ipsum in S. Gregorium, et Sylvestrum, et in S. Joannem Evangelistam; in S. Paulum vero non credunt, quia fuit assassinus.

Interrogatus quare melius credunt in Sanctum Petrum quam in S. Paulum, dixit quod ex eo, quia Deus constituit eundem S. Petrum vicarium suum, et dedit eidem potestatem absolvendi et ligandi, et quod ipse S. Petrus fecit ipso vivente miracula, et ideo credunt in ipsum inter ceteros.

Interrogatus quae miracula fecit? dixit, quod quando S. Petrus construi faciebat ecclesiam Sancti Petri in Roma, Diabolus venit ad ipsum, et dixit eidem, Ego faciam construere pulchriorem domum quam tu in breviori tempore, dicens, quod in crastinum; et modicum post Diabolus dixit S. Petro, Venias ad videndum domum quam feci dum.... quod quando intrabis dictam domum quam feci, aliquo pacto non facias signum crucis. Et eo tunc S. Petrus venit ad visitandum dictam ecclesiam seu domum, et cum fuit in conspectu dictae domus, quae nunc dicitur Sancta Maria de Rotunda, cum cautela fecit signum crucis, dicendo, et apponendo manum ad barbam, et per istam sanctam barbam: deinde ponendo manum ad stomachum, dicendo, Per istum sanctum fontem: deinde ad brachia dextra et sinistra, dicendo, Per istas spatulas, ista est domus pulchra: quo signo crucis ut supra factum, Diabolus voluit ipsam domum destruere; sed Sanctus Petrus impedivit ipsum, et adjurationem ejus fecit. Et quia dictus S. Petrus erat in valvis Ecclesiae, Diabolus non potuit exire per januam, sed affigens pedes in terram, dimisit vestigia, et exivit per unum foramen quod fecit in summitate Ecclesiae, et quod foramen adhuc est nunc, nec potuit ex post reparari; et propter dictum miraculum, quod videtur oculariter, credunt in S. Petrum: in aliis autem sanctis non credunt, quia fuerunt peccatores, et non viderunt eorum miracula.

De Sancto autem Johanne Baptista dixit, quia non petiit gratiam a Domino, expectatur quod in diem iudicii intercedet pro omnibus, et nescitur si est in terra vel in caelo, et credit quod est in paradiso terrestri.

Dicens ulterius, quod in angelis, archangelis, cherubim, et seraphim credunt, quia fuerunt creati a Deo Patre in vita aeterna.

De Virg. Maria autem dixit, quod quia solus Deus est adorandus, non sunt certi quod Virgo Maria audiat preces nostras, quia fuit humana creatura, et quod Ave Maria non est oratio, sed annunciatio et salutatio, et ideo non injungunt in poenitentiam eis qui sunt de eorum secta, quod dicant Ave Maria, et quod solus Pater Noster est vera oratio, quia a Deo facta fuit oratio illa.

De purgatorio dixit, quod nullum est purgatorium, sed viri ecclesiastici propter avaritiam ipsorum reperierunt ad extorquendas pecunias pro missis et orationibus dicendis, quae de nihilo prosunt; quia postquam homo moritur, aut est salvatus, aut est damnatus.

De aqua benedicta dixit, quod praedicant, dicunt, et credunt, quod omni anno de mensibus Maii, et in die Ascensionis Domini, quod Deus benedicit coelum, terram, aquam, herbas, flumina, fontes, et omnes fructus; et quod illa benedictio est securior quam illa quae fit a Presbyteris, quia non valet, nisi sint puri et mundi ab omni peccato; et quia quamplurimum Sacerdotes sunt peccatores, ut supra dixit, et per consequens et hujusmodi rationes non credunt in aliis sacramentis ministratis per viros ecclesiasticos. Dicens ulterius, quod tantum valet orare in stabulo quantum in templo, quia Deus est ubique.

De festivitatibus autem dixit, quod festa quae sunt praecepta a Deo, prout est dies Dominicus, festum Nativitatis Domini, festum Paschae Ascensionis, et Pentecostes, sunt celebranda; alia autem festa Virginis Mariae et sanctorum sunt festacula, et qui non vult non tenetur illa celebrare, quia non sunt praecepta, nec vigiliae ipsarum festivitatum sunt jejunandae.

De corpore Christi dicunt, quod quia viri ecclesiastici sunt ut supra mali, et pessimi vitae, et peccatores, quod non possunt consecrare corpus Christi, et non valet consecratio per ipsos facta; ideo ipsi Barbae, et qui sunt de eorum secta, non recipiunt Eucharistiam, sed loco Eucharistiae benedicunt panem, et dicunt, quod illa benedictio est majoris virtutis quam dicta consecratio, ex eo quia tantum quantum quis habet bonitatis et puritatis, tantum habet et potestatis.

De peccato camis autem dixit in primis, quod eundo per mundum, et pradicando de nocte faciunt congregationes et synagogas, in quibus in primis pradicatio fit per ipsas Barbas, et facta pradicacione incipiunt festa, solatia, et choreas ducere invicem discurrendo per locum ubi sunt cum candela accensa, atque quod se ad invicem teneant per manus, et celebratis ipsis festis et solatiis, alter ipsorum, et nescitur quis, suffocat lumen; quo suffocato, quilibet opemtur, exercet corpora super peccato camis, prout accidit casualiter, nec ibidem habetur respectus ad patrem, matrem, filiam, nec ad aliquod, dicens, quod si in dicta synagoga generetur filius, quod ille filius erit in futurum aptior ad exercendum officium Barbarum, pradicacionum, et confessionum, quam aliquis alius, quia genitus est in dicta synagoga: celebrata dicta synagoga, quilibet recedit. Dicens ulterius, quod ipsa synagoga fit semel in anno in qualibet patria, et quod Barba qui est de patria in qua fit synagoga interest in ipsa synagoga, quia habet ibidem parentes; si autem non est de patria, solum pradicat, et post dimittit fieri inter ipsos eorum synagogam, ex eo quia non posset se immiscere cum parentibus suis, et aliter non se poneret in dicta synagoga, nisi haberet parentes.

Extra autem synagogam dicunt, tenent, et pradicant, quod peccatum luxuriac non est peccatum, nisi de matre ad filium, et e converso; et de compatre ad commatrem, et non ultra: rationem reddens, quia a Deo est facta prohibitio de filia ad matrem. Nam cum Deus ascenderet ad eoelum, dixit vulgariter et formaliter ut sequitur, Crescite et multiplicare, et Saint Joanne garda te et done sariti saliiti una voulda non S. toriali pie. Interrogatus quod declaret illa verba? dixit, quod Deus ascendendo coelos dixit pradicata verba, intelligendo quod homo non debet reverti ad vulvam matris unde exivit, et dicendo respicite S. Joannem Baptistam, quia Sanctus Joannes Baptista baptisavit Christum; et ex pradicatis per legem Divinam prohibita est conjunctio de filio et de commatre; unius autem alia camalis copula permissa est, quia non est prohibita a Deo, sed solum ab Ecclesia; et ideo indifferenter cognoscunt se adinvicem, et utuntur dicta camali copula, nec contradicunt sibi invicem, quia melius est nubere quam uri.

Dicens ulterius, quod inter ipsos est honor quando Barbac agnoscunt eorundem Valdensium et de secta filias.

Et ulterius, si aliquis de secta ipsorum requirat aliquam mulierem, non contradicunt, quia non est peccatum, nec respiciunt parentes, nisi ut supra. Dicens, quod habent articulum inter ipsos qui sunt de secta, quod unus subveniat alteri, ex quo mulieres non audent eisdem negare vel contradicere. Super jurejurando dixit, quod nullo pacto jurandum est, quod nullo modo jutant inter ipsos, nec pro vero, nec pro falso, quia est peccatum mortale. Dicens ulterius, quod pro quovis delicto. quantumcunque gravi, quis non tradendus est morti nisi sit homicida.

Dicens ulterius, quod quando creantur Barbac per eorum comites et magistrum, magister convocat certos alios Barbas sectac ut supra dixit, quod addendo ad ea quae supra deposuit; dicunt et juramentum pracistant ipsi Barbac prout formaliter sequitur, Tu talis jura supra la fide tua de mantenere; multiplicare et accrescere nostra lege et de non la discoperire a persona dal monde, et que tu prometes de non jurare Dieu anul modo, et que garda la domenega, et que non farai altro coisino causa que non uvelho que sie fato a te, et que tu credie en Dieu, que a fat el sol et la luna, coelum et terram, cherubim et semphim et aquel que tu vedes: et pracstito dicto juramento, magnus magister dat eidem Barbac, sic fato, ad bibendum modicum vini; extunc mutat sibi nomen, dicendo, Desi en la la te chamaras tal; et quod ipse loquens prius vocabatur Franciscus, et nunc vocatur Martinus inter ipsos, et quod illa solemnitas habetur loco baptismi. Dicens ulterius, quod quando ipsi Barbac audiunt confessiones a gentibus de eorum secta secretam, nec confiteantur Sacerdotibus, nec recipiant Eucharistiam nisi fecte et simulate, injungunt eis quod dictam sectam teneant.

Dicens ulterius, quod postquam exercuit officium Barbarum dictac sectac per Italiam spatio sex annorum vel circa, quod a duobus annis citra transivit per montes pergendo versus provinciam Provinciac et regnum Franciac, et prima vice cum quodam alio Barba vocato Antonio de Pilhocalia de Spoleto, et anno elapso ipsi duo venerunt et transiverunt per montem Cinescium, et venerunt ad regnum Franciac, et fuerunt in provinciis Borbonii et de Rodes, Forest Alvemii, de Marca usque ad patriam de Bordelleis, et in dictis provinciis pradicaverunt eorum sectam, et confessi fuemnt quod plures in dictis provinciis de dicta eorum secta ad dictam sectam traxerunt quantum potuerunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod reperierunt se quidem alii Barbac in loco de Lymogiis, unde Colla de Joanne Baptista, de Thomasso, Paulo de Mala Came, Bartholomeo de Mocarello, Bastiano Luce, omnes de patria Spolitana, qui docuerunt ipsum loquentem, et ejus socium, et alios de eorum secta; et docuerunt eos loca

ad quae possent accedere, et ibidem praedicare, et quod extunc iuverunt ad praedicandum ad dictas patrias et regiones, ut supra.

Interrogatus quomodo nominantur omnes tenentes eorum sectam, dixit, quod de ultra montes in regno Franciac appellantur Pauperes de Lugduno, de citra vero montes in patria Italiac appellantur Pauperes Mundi; isto vero anno venit cum Andrea etiam ejus socius Barba, et venerunt per patriam Januac; deinde per Niciam et ad civitatem Aquensem; deinde ad patriam de Vivaresio, ubi reppererunt aliquos de ista secta.

Ibidem in montibus Albenacii et de Privacio, ex post versus Alvemiam apud Clarum montem, unde ad montem de Monte aureo; in quo monte sunt plures de dicta secta, et ibidem multi reperiuntur, et ibidem maxime augmentatur propter malam vitam quam tenent ecclesiastici viri.

Item ulterius dixit, quod ista secta crescit et pullulat in locis de Heretabulo de Stabulo, in Crapona et Sineria in eadem regione Alvergniac, et etiam in patria Foresii, in montibus de Fumiis, in Foretio, et de Sancto Saforino; deinde venit ad patriam Belvosii, in qua etiam viget dicta secta; unde in locis seu montibus prope villam Belli Joci et prope villam Francam, et de loco Belli Joci venerunt Lugdunum; et cum fuerint in civitate Lugduni, ubi die ultima Maii proxime fluxi, hospitati fuerunt retro Sanctum Nicesium in dicto loco signi forpicum, et se reppererunt ibidem ex deliberatione inter eos facta octo Barba, unde alii sex cum ipsis duobus vocantur Pascalis de Pasco, Jacobus de Laro, Petrus Matthei de Capriano, Hucho de Andrea, Pasturius de Jaco, et cum supradicto, Petrus de Jaco, qui praesentialiter detinetur cum dicto loquente, qui omnes octo sunt de patria Spolitana, et ibidem adinvicem congregati habuerunt conferentiam de gestis et gerendis per ipsos, recitantes loca unde veniebant et quod ibant.

Interrogatus, quis ipsorum sex reddebat rationem de patria Delphinatus? dixit quod Pascalis et Pastuchinus, et dicebant, quod fuerint in Dalphinatu, et reppererunt multos in patria Valentiniensium in montibus de secta Valdensium; et fuerint etiam in patria Ebredunensi et Vapincensi, ubi etiam reperiiebant multos qui fuerint banniti ab eorum patria, et ejecti ab eorum domibus, et propter maximas tribulationes quas habuerunt aliqui ex eis, dicebant quod volebant tenere bonam fidem: alii vero dicebant quod credebant habere remedium, et quod volebant habere et tenere eorum sectam.

Dicens ulterius, quod cum ipse et alius Andreas Barba ejus socius, de mense Martii proximo fluxu transirent per Provinciam veniendo ab eorum domibus, in ipsa patria Provinciac et prope civitatem Aquensem reppererunt tres qui dicebant quod erant de Dalphinatu, qui tres agnoverunt ipsos Barbas in habitibus eorum, videlicet in mantellis, et habuerunt invicem verba de dicta eorum secta; et ipsi tres homines dixerunt, quod erant banniti, et expectabant habere gratiam et restitui in eorum bonis et patria, et continuare in eorum proposito primo.

Item dixit, quod ipse Pascalis et Pastuchinus qui fuerunt in Dalphinatu, dicebant, quod quantum potuerunt conati fuerunt consolari ipsos bannitos et expulsos a Dalphinatu, sed causante dura et nimia persecutione compatiebantur vecordes et remissi; alii autem erant malae voluntatis redeundi, sperantes habere gratiam.

Dicens ulterius, quod praenominati duo Barba dicebant, quod habebant magnos persecutores, et ipsos in patria Delphinatus, viz. Reverend. Dominum Archiepiscopum Ebredunensem, et Dominum Poncium Poncii Consiliarium, et Dominum Oroncium Eme Judicem gran. quem Dominum Poncium comminabantur; quod si ipsum repperirent, facerent sibi ex fato suo.

Dicens ulterius, quod ipsi octo Barba discesserunt omnes a civitate Lugduni, et ipse loquens mutavit socium, quia loco dicti Andreae Barba, cepit dictum Barbara Petrum praesentialiter detentum; alii vero Barba discesserunt, et retrocesserunt ad eorum patriam ex deliberatione inter eos facta, ut dicebant.

Dictus autem Petrus Barba, ejus novus socius et ipse loquens reversi sunt ad Dominam nostram de Podio, ut supra dixit, et ad alia loca Alvergniac, Foresii, Belli Joci, tendendo ad civitatem d'Autun in Burgundia, in qua duo, et in quadam valle, in qua est quoddam proximum flumen, quod discurrit a flumine de Lem; in qua valle sunt aliqui de dicta secta, et ex post venerunt per patriam Belli Joci, unde prope villam dicti Belli Joci et Villac Francac, ubi etiam de eorum secta consortes multi sunt et ibidem morantur, et exinde

redierunt Lugdunum ad praedictum hospitium, et ex post arripuerunt viam apud Bressam et ad Sanctum Glaudium, et in Sancto Glaudio, et in quibusdam montibus citra et ultra; ubi sunt plures de eorum secta. Quilibet praedicant et eos de confessione audiunt, et exinde recesserunt et iverunt Gebennas et Niciacum, et a Niciaco ad locum Aquac Bellac; de Aqua Bella ad Camemm, et ibidem prope Camemm aliquos paucos comperierunt de eorum secta; deinde venerunt ad montem de Valono, Neuachiam et Bardonenchiam; et de Bardonenchia ad locum Ulcii: et inde Juvencellori et Salicis Ulcii usque prope collem Costac Planac, transeuntes apud Pratum Jalatum, in quo monte fuerunt capti et reversi, ducti, ultra reducti ad villam Ulcii per Officiarios Dalphinales Ulcii, ut apparet in processu super hoc facto.

Interrogatus, si sciebat quod in valle Prati Jallati erant aliqui de eorum secta? dixit, quod sic voce et fama referentibus, et quod si dicti de Prato Jalato voluissent confiteri eis, audivissent eos, et quod illa spe transivissent per dictum locum animo exercendi eorum officium et ad consolandum dictos Valdenses ibidem commorantes.

Interrogatus, quando audivit aliquos de confessione quomodo consueverunt ipsos absolvere? dixit et respondet, quod non faciunt more Sacerdotum, sed dicunt eis quod teneant eorum sectam firmam; et insuper injungunt eisdem quod dicent aliquibus vicibus Pater noster pro poenitentia, non autem Ave Maria, neque permittunt peregrinationes Italiac, elemosynas ex amore Dei.

Interrogatus, si inter ipsos Barbas de ista secta fecerunt delibemtionem de se reperiendo in aliquo loco? dixit, quod duo alii, videlicet Joannes de Cristophoro et Libemtus de Coqueto, se debebant reperire cum ipsis duobus, videlicet, ipso loquente et ejus socio, in loco de Tortona in Lombardia.

Interrogatus, ubi habuit colloquium cum ipsis duobus proxime nominatis, Joanne Cristophoro et Libemto de Coqueto? dixit, quod ipsi una cum ipso Petro ejus socio ibidem detentis.

Interrogatus, quando audit aliquos de confessione de ipsa secta, de quibus peccatis ut plurimum confitentur? dixit, quod quando cohabitatur filius cum matre, et pater cum filia, et cum commatre et compatre, extra tamen synagogam, et quod multi confitentur perseverare in dictis peccatis, et cohabitare cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod confitentur de septem peccatis mortalibus, et non de aliis peccatis.

ISTA Peyronetta citata vetit, et tamen medio juramento, omnia negavit, tamen jussa mitti in carcerem, et missa, omnia sponte confessa est; videlicet, quod a viginti quinque annis eos vidit et cognovit, eorum praedicationes audivit, de non jurando per Deum, de festis aliquibus non colendis, de non potestate Sacerdotum, et sacpe de purgatorio, et vanum orare pro mortuis, de aqua benedicta, de dando potius elemosynas pauperibus quam in ecclesia offerendo, de sanctis quod non habeant potestatem nos juvandi, de Romipetagiis, de jejuniis, et unde ortum habuerit secta, et quomodo oblationes desinunt facere, quomodo vidit eos novem aut decem vicibus, et quatuor vicibus eisdem confessa est peccata sua, nec unquam confessa est Curato suo, eis credidit et fidem dedit, misericordiam petiit, et repetita fuit.

Processus Inquisitionis contra Peyronettam, ex codice H. Waldensium in public. Biblioth. Cantabrig.

INQUISITIONALIS processus factus et formatus coram egregiis et circumspectis viris Dominis Antonio Fabri, Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, haereticacque pravitatis in toto Dalphinatu, et comitatibus Viennensis, Valentiniensis, et Diensis, Genemli Inquisitore, a sancta sede apostolica specialiter et immediate deputato, et Christofforo de Salhiente etiam Decretorum Doctore, Canonico, Vicario, et Officiali Valentiac.

Ad instantiam et prosecutionem honorandi viri Domini Valentini de Razeriis, Jurium Professoris, Procuratorisque Fiscalis Valentiac, et in hac parte promotoris in favorem sanctae fidei Catholicac, ejusque Officii Inquisitionis Deputati.

Contra et adversus Peyronettam relictam Petri Bemudi, alias Fornerii, loci Belli Respectus, Valentiniensis dioecesis, actatis suae quinquaginta annorum vel circa, de nefandissima haeresi Valdensium, seu Pauperum de Lugduno, quae in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, inculpatam et diffamatam.

In nomine sanctae et individuae Trinitatis. Ex serie atque tenore huiusmodi veri publici inquisitionalis, omnibus et singulis et Christi fidelibus tam praesentibus quam inde futuris luculenter innotescat, et in perpetuum redigatur memoria. Ex anno nativitatis Domini millesimo quatercentesimo nonagesimo, quarto, et die Mercurii quae fuit, et intitulata extitit vigesima nona mensis Januarii, apud locum Belli Respectus, et in domo probi viri Glaudii sua hospitis ipsius loci, et in camera nova ipsius domus, coramque egregio et circumsperto viro Domino Antonio Fabri, Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, Inquisitore sanctae fidei Catholicae, auctoritate apostolica deputato, cum assistentia mei Vincenzii Gobaudi notarii, et in hac parte conscribatur, de cuius quidem Domini Inquisitoris potestate constat, literis apostolicis in forma brevi inferius loco et ordine insertis.

Comparuit ibidem praedicta Peyronetta, relicta Petri Bemudi, alias Fornerii, Belli Respectus, Valentiniensis dioecesis, quae de mandato et auctoritate ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris praecedentibus debitis informationibus contra eam ad causam haeresis pauperum de Lugduno, sive Valdensium quae in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, quae inculcata et diffamata existit, sumptis atque receptis factisque monitionibus genemlibus contra quoscumque dicta labe infectos in parochia dicti loci executis, personaliter citata extitit ad respondendum de fide Catholica, necnon de his quibus est inculcata ad causam haeresis praedictae, et ibidem per memoratum Dominum Inquisitorem, suo medio juramento ad sancta Dei Evangelia praestito, et ad poenam perjurii, et criminis sibi imposui, habendi pro integraliter confessato ac excommunicationis et viginti quinque ducatorum auri, de veritate dicenda super his quibus interrogabitur, examinata et interrogata; quae quidem Peyronetta praedicta volens, ut dixit, mandatis et praecipis iustitiae obtemperare atque parere, paratam se obtulit omnem quam super his quibus interrogabitur siverit veritatem dicere et deponere, et licet sit foemina simplex et ignara ac ingenio grossa, tamen dixit vixisse toto tempore vitae suae ad instar et modum fidelium Christianorum, et secundum sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae traditionem, adeo quod non praestendit unquam a vera fide Catholica deviasse nec aberrasse, nec per ea quaecumque dicet deviare seu aberrare intendit, de quo fuit solemniter protestata.

Et praelibatus Dominus Inquisitor, non obstantibus excusationibus supra per dictam Peyronettam deductis et allegatis, ex sui officii incumbencia, etiam propter notoriam diffamationem dictae Peyronettae, prout latius ex tenore dictarum secretarum informationum colligitur, ideo ipsam duxit examinandam et interrogandam per modum infra scriptum.

Et primo fuit praenominata Peyronetta in hac parte delata per praelibatum Dominum Inquisitorem interrogata et examinata qua de causa seu ad quid venit? dicta Peyronetta coram eodem Domino Inquisitore dixit et respondit quod, ex eo quia fuit citata, et advocata personaliter coram eodem Domino Inquisitore comparitura pro respondendo de fide Catholica, aut se excusando super inquisitione haeresis sectae Valdensium, seu alias Chagmardorum nuncupatae, contra eam ut asseritur formata.

Interrogata quid est dicta haeresis sive secta Valdensium, alias Chagmardorum? dixit et respondit nescire, neque scire velle quid sit. Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore viderit seu cognoverit nonnullos dictae haeresis sive sectae magistros seu praedicatores qui discurrere solent per rura et loca campestria eundo de domo ad domum, faciendo praedicationes clandestinas? dixit et respondit quod non, nec scit quinam dicantur dicti praedicatores.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore audiverit aliquas praedicationes sive documenta ab aliquibus hominibus secrete praedicantibus, praesertim horis nocturnis? dixit et respondit quod non.

Interrogata si sciat se esse de secta quae vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum diffamatam et inculpatam? dixit et respondit quod non, nec posse super hoc caput credi, inculpari seu diffamari legitimo titulo aut ratione aliqua. Interrogata an unquam fuerit requisita aut instigata per quospiam de tenendo sectam ipsam, aut aliam quancumque? dixit et respondit quod non. Interrogata an sciat aliquos de loco praedicto Belli Respectus fore et esse de secta praedicta Chagmardorum? dixit et respondit quod non. Interrogata an ipsa Peyronetta sit de secta praedicta Chagmardorum, aut alias unquam ipsam sectam tenuerit, sive in eadem instructa fuerit? dixit et respondit, quod non est, nec unquam fuit de secta ipsa, nec esse, nec fuisse vult.

Interrogata an velit stare depositionibus testium fide dignorum ubi dicant eam esse de dicta secta? dixit et respondit quod ita, dum tamen non sint sibi suspecti aut inimici.

Interrogata an habeat aliquos inimicos de quibus dubitare posset aliquid contra eam dicere velle contra veritatem? respondit se nescire. Amplius non fuit interrogata nec examinata; sed audita ipsius Peyronettac responsione per praedictum Dominum Inquisitorem, quia secundum mentem et tenorem informationum contra eandem ad causam hacresis praedictae sumptarum, eidem Domino Inquisitori visum fuit ipsam Peyronettam nimis sufficienter super praemissis respondisse, veritatemque nullatenus dixisse: ideo volens latius cum ea inquirere, ordinavit ipsam duci apud carceres episcopales Valentiac, et ibidem tute custodiri et detineri donec sufficientius de his quibus ex tenore dictarum informationum reperitur culpabilis, responderit.

Demum vero anno quo supra, et die Veneris quae fuit, et intitulata extitit ultima mensis Januarii, apud Valentiam, et palatio episcopali ejusdem, videlicet in camem residentiac praelibati Domini Inquisitoris, ac coram eodem existens et personaliter constituta praenominata Peyronetta mandato ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris infra carceres episcopales detenta, quae, ut dixit, attendens et considemns exhortationes sibi novissime factas de dicendo veritatem super interrogatoriis tangentibus sectam praedictam, promittendo sibi gratiam et misericordiam si id faceret, ideo meliori et salubriori uti volens consilio, non obstantibus perjuriis, et aliis variationibus per eam superius in respondendo commissis, confidendo ad plenum de benignitate ipsius Domini Inquisitoris, paratam se obtulit omnem veritatem quam super meritis ipsius sectae sciverit dicere et sponte confiteri, ac suam exonemte conscientiam, rogando sibi indulgeri et parceri ratione perjurii et de vacillationibus praedictis, et inde suam depositionem sive confessionem benigniter admitti, erroresque suos, si quos habeat, caritative et gratiose corrigi, submittendo se misericordiae et ordinationi sanetae matris Ecclesiae.

Et praelibatus Dominus Inquisitor, recepto ab ipsa Peyronetta corporali juramento de veritate dicenda praestito, impositaque sibi poena perjurii et rigorosae sibi ferendae justitiae, casu quo quidquam de ipsa veritate maliciose occultaverit, ad ipsius examen processit, in hunc qui sequitur modum infrascriptum.

In primis enim dixit et sponte confessa est, quod dudum sunt viginti quinque anni elapsi, vel circa, quibus venerunt ad domum quondam Petri Fornerii sui mariti duo homines extranei, induti vestibus grisei coloris, qui, ut sibi visum fuit, loquebantur lingua Italica, sive Lombardica, quos praedictus ejus maritus receperunt in dicta sua domo, amore Dei: tandem ipsis ibidem existentibus hora nocturna, post coenam unus ipsorum legere coepit unum parvum librum quem secum deferbat, dicendo in eodem descripta fuisse Evangelia, et praecepta legis, quae ibidem dicebat se explicare et declarare velle in praesentia omnium ibidem circumstantium, quia dicebat se fore missum ex parte Dei ad reformandam fidem Catholicam, eundo per mundum ad instar Apostolorum pro praedicando bonis et simplicibus gentibus de modo et forma serviendi Deo, et vivendi secundum ejus mandata.

Et inter cactem dicebant quod nemo alteri facere debet id quod sibi fieri nollet.

Item quod solus Deus emt colendus et adorandus, et deprecandus, quia ipse solus est qui nos potest juvare.

Item quod jurare pro quavis occasione vel causa Deum, pro vero vel mendacio, aut aliud quodcunque facere juramentum ubi poneretur ista locutio per, emt magnum peccatum.

Item quod sacramentum matrimonii debebat fideliter et firmiter custodiri.

Item quod bona opem quae fiunt ante mortem hominis plus prosunt, quam omnia quae fiunt post mortem.

Item quod sancti et sanctae non erant deprecandi in nostrum auxilium, quia non poterunt nos in aliquo juvare nisi solus Deus.

Item quod dies Dominicales super omnia alia festa debebant solenniter coli, alia vero festa dicebant fuisse per Ecclesiam inventa, quae non erant de necessitate colenda; imo potemt aliquis opemri in ipsis, exceptis festivitibus Apostolorum, et aliis majoribus quas non exprimebant.

Item quod viri ecclesiastici nimias habebant et possidebant divitias atque bona ultra quam oportebat, ob quod multa mala faciebant, quorum aliqui, causantibus eorum superfluitatibus et bonorum abundantis, erant foenemtores, usurarii, superbi, et avaritia pleni; alii vero nimis lubriciter et inhoneste vivebant, tenendo meretrices in domibus suis palam et publice, sic malum exemplum ostendendo in populo.

Item quod prae dicti Sacerdotes, eorum causante mala vita, non habebant majorem potestatem absolvendi quam habebant ipsi praedicatores, sive hujus sectae magistri, imo ipsi magistri sive praedicatores, licet essent laici, habebant tantam potestatem quantam ipsi Sacerdotes.

Item quod summus Pontifex ex quo non observabat sanctitatem quam debebat observare, non habebat aliquam potestatem, dicendo de eodem in Haec verba, Autant crois et autant malvais est le Pape comme nengun autre, et per se non sages de puissance.

Item quod in alio mundo nullum emt purgatorium, dicendo, quod quando quis moritur, ejus anima tendit ad paradisum, illico et incontinenter, dummodo bene et juste vixerit; si vero male, ad infernum.

Item et subsequenter quod frustra fiebant deprecationes, cantaria et alia suffragia pro animabus defunctorum; nihilque valebat id quod faciebant Sacerdotes eundo per coemiterium, aspergendo aquam benedictam supra sepulturas mortuorum, dicendo, Kirie Eleyson, Christe Eleyson, etc.

Item quod Deus in initio mundi omnes aquas benedixemt, et omnia alia quae fecemt, propter quod non emt necesse itemto aquam benedicere per Sacerdotes, quae etiam nihil plus valebat quam alia aqua.

Item quod praenominati Sacerdotes ex semetipsis invenemnt seu reperiemnt, quod in alio mundo emt purgatorium, ad effectus ut faciendo cantaria et deprecationes pro defunctis, majora sibi acquirant bona, ex quibus eorum malam vitam sustinerent.

Item quod melius et magis meritorium emt dare elemosynam alicui pauperi infirmo aut leproso, quam offerre in ecclesia Sacerdotibus praedictis, qui erant nimis abundantes bonis.

Item quod ita bonum et utile emt orare Deum in domo aut alibi, sicut in ecclesia, quia Deus ubique est.

Item quod sancti nec sanctae, quamvis propter eorum bene merita essent in paradiso collocati, non habebant potestatem nos in aliquo juvandi, et ideo non debebant deprecari in nostrum auxilium.

Item quod in vanum emt recurrere ad imagines sanctorum et sanctatum, orando coram ipsis, quia nullam habebant virtutem, cum non essent nisi res materiales et pieturac factae in parietibus.

Item propterea nihil prodesse potemt facere peregrinationes et Romipetagia ad orandum coram imaginibus sanctorum et sanctarum, cum nihil possint in nostrum auxilium, ut praedictum est.

Item quod non emt necesse jejunare aliquas alias vigilias quam festivitatum Paschac, Pentecostes, Nativitatis et aliarum magnarum festivitatum Dominicalium, et potissime diebus Veneris emt etiam jejunandum.

Item quod ipsi praedicatores sive magistri hujusmodi sectae, et Sacerdotes seu viri ecclesiastici olim solebant esse unius et ejusdem legis et ordinis, sed cum ipsi viri ecclesiastici voluerunt insequi avaritiam et vanitates hujus mundi, et ipsi praedicatores in ipsa paupertate manere voluerunt; ideo fuit facta inter eos divisio, et effecti fuerunt inimici, adeoque cum numerus ipsorum praedicatorum et aliorum hominum justorum hujusmodi sectam tenuerint, adhuc esset parvus atque rarus, ideo eis emt necesse incedere occulte,

sicut faciebant Christus et ejus Apostoli; quia nisi ipsi praedicatores ambularent caute et secrete, dubitabant ab aliis offendi et male tractari.

Interrogata de nominibus ipsorum hominum sive praedicatorum talia praedicantium? dixit et respondit nescivisse eorum nomina.

Interrogata an propter ea quae dicebant, non esse orandum pro defunctis, distulerit et obmiserit portare oblationes seu offerre in ecclesia pro ipsis defunctis? dixit et respondit quod multoties fecit oblationes in ecclesia, quas non fecisset nisi dubitasset quod aliqui male praesumpsissent de ea, et quod sibi impropemretur quod esset Chagnarda.

Interrogata quis dedit sibi notitiam dictorum praedicatorum sive magistrorum, seu alias quomodo introducta fuit ad conversandum cum eis? dixit et deposuit verum esse quod olim ipsa loquente existente cum Telmono Paschalis, quodam dicti loci Belli Respectus, quadam die de qua non recolit, et ipsis adinvicem de multis rebus conferentibus, descenderunt in propositum de modo vivendi secundum mandata Dei, et inter cactem alia verba inter eos tunc habita, praenominatus Telmonus Paschalis dixit sibi loquenti Haec verba vel eis similia, videlicet, Aves nous james auvi parler dung plen pung de mond, que si non em, tout le monde saria a fin: quae quidem loquens sibi respondit quod ita, videlicet cuidam domino Andreac.... de loco Pigesoni, Capellano, olim Vicario ipsius loci Belli Respectus, qui quadam die Ramis Palmarum, praedicando in ipso loco Belli Respectus dicebat similia verba, videlicet, Ces ung plen pung de gent que sosten tot le mond, et si aquello gent non em, tot le monde saria a fin; quo tunc praenominatus Telmonus Paschalis replicavit in Haec verba, Et daquelles gens vos parle yeu; dicendo sibi quod si contingeret ipsas gentes venire ad ejus domum, quod audacter loqueretur cum eis, et eorum documenta auscultaret, cum exinde melius se haberet; tamen dixit quod dictus Telmonus dubitabat ipsam, ne alicui praemissa panderet seu detegeret, ut moris est mulierum superflue loqui, ideo sibi fecit fieri juramentum super literis de non dicendo aut manifestando alicui quidquam de praemissis, prout et ipsa loquens fecit, et ex post ipsa loquens fuit inclinata et affecta videre dictas gentes prout fecit ut supra.

Interrogata si viderit dictos magistros sive praedicatores, de quibus superius ultra vicem praedictam? dixit et respondit quod a supradicto tempore viginti quinque annorum citra, vidit diversis vicibus, de quarum numero dixit se non posse bene recordari; tamen existimatione sua credit eos vidisse in universo novem aut decem vicibus, inclusa prima vice superius declarata.

Interrogata an qualibet vice qua eos vidit, audiverit similia documenta, modo et forma quibus superius declaravit? dixit et respondit quod ita.

Item, de dictis novem vel decem vicibus quibus dictos magistros praedicantes vidit et audivit? dixit dicta loquens quod fuit aliquoties in domo praenominati Telmoni Paschalis et Guillelmi Paschalis, ubi ipsi praedicatores fuerunt et fecerunt eorum praedicationes modo praemisso, praesentibus omnibus illis de eadem domo, videlicet dicto Telmono et Guillelmo Paschalis; de nominibus autem aliorum praesentium dixit se non recordari.

Item, similiter dixit eos vidisse in domo Petri Gamerii ejusdem loci certis vicibus, de quibus nec de tempore non potest recordari, ubi etiam fuerint factae praedicationes praedictae, praesentibus eodem Petro Gamerii et aliis de eadem domo, quorum nomina ignorat.

Interrogata si aliqui alii circumvicini interfuerint in praedictis praedicationibus factis in domibus eorum Paschalorum et Petri Gamerii? dixit quod non, quantum sibi potest recordari.

Interrogata an sciat quantis vicibus dicti praedicatores fuerunt in domo sua sive sui quondam mariti? dixit et respondit juxta acstimationem suam, quod fuerunt in dicta ejus domo quatuor aut quinque vicibus, et ibidem praedicationes assuetas fecerunt.

Interrogata qui sunt illi qui erant praesentes et audientes in dictis praedicationibus factis in domo praedicta? dixit et respondit quod Petrus Bemudi alias Fornerii ejusdem loquentisque maritus dum vivebat; necnon

aliquoties ibidem veniebant Joannes Prodome, et aliquando Telmonus Paschalis quidam, et Guilielmus Paschalis ac Petrus Gamerii, seu eorum alter alterutris vicibus, et aliquoties duo vel tres eorundem simul.

Interrogata si unquam confessa fuerit peccata sua alicui ex dictis prae-dicatoribus sive magistris? dixit et respondit quod singulis vicibus quibus ipsi praedicatores fuerunt in domo sui quondam mariti, ipsa confessa est peccata sua alteri ex eis genibus flexis, ac si fuisset coram suo proprio Sacerdote, et inde, facta confessione, ipsam absolvebat, manum ad caput imponendo more Sacerdotum.

Interrogata quam poenitentiam sibi imponebant praedicti praedicatores sive magistri pro peccatis confessatis? dixit et respondit quod diceret frequenter Pater noster, et hoc tantum quantum possem, et quod jejunaret aliquibus diebus Veneris, et faceret aliquas elemosynas secundum suam facultatem.

Interrogata quot vicibus confessa est dictis praedicatoribus? dixit quod tantis vicibus quantis fuerunt in dicta eorum domo, videlicet quatuor aut quinque vicibus, prout supradictum est.

Interrogata an confessa fuerit Capellano suo vidisse et cognovisse praedictos magistros sive praedicatores, eorumque praedicationes audivisse? dixit et respondit quod non, quia non credebat male agere. Interrogata si crediderit seu alias dederit fidem supradictis praedicatoribus sive magistris et eorum documentis et doctrinae? dixit et sponte confessa est quod tanquam mulier insipiens et innocens et facilis ad decipiendum, credit et dedit fidem eisdem praedicatoribus et eorum doctrinis sive documentis, credendo bene et salubriter agere; nec putabat propterea errare in aliquo. Veruntamen ubi videatur antecognoscatur ipsam in aliquo aberrasse, se submitit benignae correctioni sanctae matris Ecclesiae et eorundem dominorum Inquisitoris sive Officialis, petendo de omnibus in quibus potuit hactenus in praemissis errare, veniam et misericordiam sibi impetiri.

Memoratus enim Dominus Inquisitor, audita confessione praedictae Peironettae, volens super eadem deliberare, necnon cum eadem latius inquirere super praemissis, terminum statuit et assignavit eidem Peironettae ad latius deponendum et declarandum super praemissis et aliis audiendis, deliberatione ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris hinc ad diem crastinam circa horam meridiei: et iterum ordinavit eam stare sub praedicta carcerum custodia.

Crastina autem die supra novissime per praedictum Dominum Inquisitorem pro termino in causa hujusmodi assignata, quae fuit intitulata Sabbati, prima mensis Februarii in camera superius mentionata, et coram praememorato Domino Inquisitore venit et comparuit supranominata Peironetta ibidem per carcerarium episcopalem de mandato praefati Domini Inquisitoris ad actum hujusmodi a carceribus ipsis educta, petens et humiliter requirens se a dictis carceribus relaxari, paratam se offerendo facere quae deberet, necnon latius respondere super omnibus quibus interrogabatur: et Dominus Inquisitor praefatus visa ipsius loquentis superius facta confessione, ad majorem veritatis corroborantiam duxit eandem super eadem et omnibus in ea contentis examinandam et repetendam, vigore juramenti per eam supra praestiti, ac sub poena qua supra. Quae quidem Peironetta delata, audito tenore jam dictae suae confessionis sibi per me notarium infra scriptum de verbo ad verbum in vulgari sermone recitatis et declaratis, ac per eam, ut dixit, integraliter intellectis, dixit, deposuit, et sponte confessa est ea omnia et singula in jam dicta ipsius depositione et confessione, singula singulis, contenta et descripta fore et esse verum et veritati consona, eisque tanquam recte et legitime dictis et confessatis, persistit, pro quibus omnibus et singulis se submitit misericordiae sanctae matris Ecclesiae et jam dictorum dominorum Inquisitoris et Officialis, petendo et requirendo se a carceribus quibus pro praemissis detinetur relaxari: et praeterea addendo praedictae suae confessioni dixit audivisse a praefatis praedicatoribus sive magistris praedicantibus, quod Sacerdotes recipientes pecunias pro missis celebrandis comparabantur Judaeis qui vendidit Christum propter pecuniam: et illi qui dabant ipsas pecunias dictis Sacerdotibus occasione ipsarum missarum, comparabantur Judaeis qui Christum emerunt pecuniis.

Item, addendo dixit et confessa est, quod praedicti praedicatores dum recedebant a domo sua aliquoties dabant sibi certam quantitatem acuum sive d'aiguilles, et ejus quondam maritus dum vivebat dabat eis pecunias pro poena ipsorum.

Interrogata quantum dabat eis dictus ejus quondam maritus pro dicta eorum poena, dixit nescire, quia non vidit numemri. Interrogata qui sunt illi de dicta ejus domo qui dictos homines sive pradicatores viderunt, et audiverunt eorum pradicaciones? dixit quod Francisca ejusdem loquentis filia et Simeon Acto maritus ipsius Franciscac. Interrogata si fuerit unquam in loco de Bareilloniam ubi dictos magistros pradicatores audiverit pradicantes? dixit et respondit verum esse, et sibi recordari quod olim sunt decem anni elapsi vel circa quibus Petrus Fornerii ejus quondam vir ac ipsa loquens accesserunt apud dictum locum Bareilloniam ad visitandum Fabrentes ipsius loci, quia erant et adhuc sunt affines ejus, et visitando steterunt ibidem uno vel duobus diebus, quo interim ipsa loquens et pradictus ejus maritus quondam, quodam vespere iverunt de domo Joannis Fabri ubi erant hospitati, ad domum Moneti Fabri, fratris ipsius Joannis, pro eundem Monetum visitando, tandem dum intrassent domum ipsius Moneti reperierunt ibidem duos ex pradicatoribus sive magistris pradictis, qui ibidem pracsente dicto Moneto et ejus familia pradicabant: et videns dictus Monetus ipsam loquentem et ejus virum ibidem ex incogitato intrasse et advenisse, fuit valde tristatus atque iratus de adventu ipsorum conjugum ad causam dictorum pradicatorum ibidem secreto pradicantium, et videntes ipsa loquens et dictus ejus quondam vir, eundem Monetum esse ita iratum et male contentum propter adventure ipsorum, post modicum temporis ab ipsa domo recesserunt. Interrogata quid sibi dixerunt supradicti duo pradicatores? dixit quod nihil.

Interrogata si propter adventum suum et sui viri, dicti pradicatores desierint pradicare? dixit quod non.

Interrogata an ipsa et ejus vir eo tunc cognoverunt dictos pradicatores esse de consortio et conversatione ipsorum? dixit et respondit quod in verbis suis cognovit eos esse de illis.

Interrogata si unquam alias videmt dictos duos homines sive pradicatores in domo sua de Bello Respectu? dixit non posse recordari.

Interrogata quid dicebant dicti pradicatores in eorum pradicacionibus? dixit non posse bene recordari, quia paucum stetemnt ibidem propter turbationem pradicti Moneti. Interrogata an dicti pradicatores eo tunc iverint ad domum supradicti Joannis Fabri? dixit quod non.

Amplius non fuit eo tunc interrogata, tamen praclibatus Dominus Inquisitor certis motus respectibus etiam ut dictac mulieri parcat laboribus et expensis, recepto prius ab eadem juramento per eam ad sancta Dei Evangelia pracsento, de se repracsentando toties quoties vocabitur, impositaque sibi poena hacreticis relapsis a jure indicta, casu quo comparere obmiserit, tandem a carceribus pradictis quibus ob causam hujusmodi detinebatur, dixit et jussit relaxandam usque ad primam delibemtionem sive novum mandatum.

Rursum vero anno quo superius et die Dominica Ramis Palmarum, computata vigesima tertia mensis Martii, apud locum pradictum Belli Respectus, et coram nobis Henrico Dileri Capellano, et Vincentio Gobaudi, notariis publicis et causac hujusmodi scribis, ac in hac parte commissis per egregium et circumspectum virum Dominum Christophorum de Salhiente Decretorum Doctorem Vicariumque, et Officialem Valentiam, vivac vocis oraculo expresse deputatis, et ibidem infra domum claustralem ipsius loci, vocata supradicta Peironetta, et ea in pracsentia nostra personaliter constituta, ipsam juxta nobis commissa de et super omnibus et singulis per eam pridem superius dictis, et confessatis, eis omnibus prius lectis et in lingua vulgarica et laica de verbo ad verbum recitatis et declaratis; duximus repetendam et re-examinandam, quibus omnibus et singulis per eam ut dixit ad plenum perceptis, ejus medio juramento ad sancta Dei Evangelia pracsento, impositaque sibi poena qua superius, videlicet quae de jure hacreticis relapsis debetur de dicenda veritate, dicta Peironetta dixit et sponte confessa est ea omnia et singula supra per eam dicta, deposita et confessata, fore et esse vem, veritati consona, prout et quemadmodum scripta sunt superius, eisque omnibus et singulis tanquam recte et legitime confessatis atque depositis, persistit petendo continue veniam et misericordiam. Actum uti supra pracsente venembili viro Domino Guilielmo Blanchardi, Vicario dicti loci. Quibus sic gestis dicta Peironetta virtute juramenti per eam superius sacpissime pracsenti, ac sub poenis quibus supra pracsmissis se repracsentare coram praclibato Domino Inquisitore ac Domino Officiali toties quoties vocabitur ex parte eorum.

Processum, sive acta pracscedentia, sumpsit et recepit ego Notarius subsignatus,

GOBAUDI.